

THE
Revision Revifed:

OR, A
VINDICATION

OF THE

Right Reverend Father in God,

GEORGE,

Lord Bishop of

WINTON,

AGAINST

A late PAMPHLET, Published by *L. W. Permissu
Superiorum*, and Entituled, A Revision of Dr. Morley's
Judgment in Matters of Religion:

OR,

An Answer to several Treatises of his, Written on several
Occasions, concerning the Church of *Rome*, and most
of those Doctrines which are controverted betwixt her
and the Church of *England*.

LONDON,

Printed for Randal Taylor, near Stationers-Hall. 1684.

THE
Revision Revised:

GEORGE

WINTON

LONDON

TO THE
READER,

READER,

MY Lord of *Winton* is a Person of that Eminence in Place and Dignity, in Piety and Learning, and all other Qualifications which may become a Man of his Order; and withall of that constant Adherence to the Cause and Interest of the *King* and *Church*, in Our late Troubles, and of so known an Integrity, that he needs not the Recommendation of so mean a Pen as mine is. Only I could not but think it fit to acquaint thee, how his Name comes to be concerned in these Papers. After he was come to above Fourscore Years of Age, which the *Psalmist* has made the utmost Stage of Man's Life, and that now he was, as he thought, putting into a quiet Harbour; no sooner was he in those thoughts (having always lived an Active Life before) but that he was Attack'd on both Sides with unexpected Onsets. On the one hand, Mr. *Baxter* having lain Dormant ever since the King's Restauration, broke

To the READER.

out afresh into an Old Quarrel, wherein, tho he had been formerly Baffled, yet he thought now be-like, the Bishop's Age would secure him from an Answer, in which hope of his yet he hath been so miserably mistaken, that the *Vindication*, that his Lordship hath made of himself against him, is written with that Briskness of Stile and Closeness of Argument, that his Adversary, however willing he may be, will never be able more to hold up his Pen against him. On the other hand, a Libeller, under the Name of *Elymas the Sorcerer*, assaulted him with a Calumnious Report, grounded on a Writing of *Mainburg a French Jesuit*, that he was a *Papist*, or Popishly inclined, and had a hand in perverting or designing the perversion of her late *R. H.* To clear himself from this Aspersions, he published several *Treatises*, which had been written by him, upon several Occasions, wherein he discovers and makes known sufficiently what his Principles and his Judgment had been, all along, concerning the Church of *Rome* and her Doctrins, as they differ from Ours. But it happens in Troubles as it doth in Waves, that they come not single or alone, but one tumbling upon the neck of another. *Ἐπὶ κύματι κύμα κυλινδρεται.* Scarce had his Lordship done with those Two Furious Spirits, and now promised Himself an undisturbed Repose, but out comes a *Third* of the same Temper, tho of a

Con-

To the READER.

Contrary Complexion; viz. a Catholick Gentleman, One whose Zeal is as high, and his Passion as Great as that of the other Two, and his Language so Extravagant, that he shews neither any Reverence to the *Dignity* of the Person, nor the Sentiments of Common Humanity to his *Age*, as I could prove by several Scoffs and Flouts, with which he Treats him meerly upon that Account. Wherefore, if I have been any where Sharp, both he and you, Reader, must excuse me for this Reason, in that he, viz. L. W. had no Provocation at all given him by the Bishop, who only Published those Treatises to satisfy the World, that he was no *Papist*; and besides, of what ever Quality he may be, is, it is not to be doubted, much inferior to the Bishop, both in *Dignity* and *Age*. But I have had a Constant Provocation before me, and had not, I humbly conceive, upon me those Obligations of Respect and Veneration, which he had.

As for the Matter in Debate and the Arguments here used, they are things, (most of them) so generally well known, and have been so often Treated of, that that Consideration made it the less necessary for me to spend much Paper, or lavish away my Time and thy Patience about them. However, I Judged it would be somewhat for thy satisfaction to set down L. W's *Preface* at length in his
own

To the READER.


own Words, and then afterward to give it, in all its Parts, its particular Answer; to shew how easy it would have been to have done the like throughout the whole Reveiw of all the several *Treatises*; but that by so doing, the Work must have swelled into a large Volume; and therefore I contented my self in those other Pieces with a shorter and more Compendious way of Answer, and yet so, as not to omit or pass over any thing that was truly Material and any way Considerable. His Review of the *Latine Treatise* concerning Prayers for the Dead, Invocation of Saints, and Purgatory, hath not been so much Omitted, as Reserved to another Time, if Occasion shall so require; tho truly I think the best way of Answering it, if ever it be Answered, will be to Translate it into *English*, first, by which Means the Business will be as good as half done.

Farewel.

ERRATA.

Page 22, line 14 read what it was. p. 43. l. 4. r. and the Efficacy. p. 47. l. 26. r. some thing. p. 56. l. 12. r. matter of Faith. p. 57. l. 9. r. not only not grounded. p. 81. l. 14. r. and yet you your self. p. 87. l. 24. r. and then most necessary. p. 88. l. 24. r. Bishops the Prisoners. p. 89. l. 26. r. no unusual thing. p. 100. l. 30. r. why they may not, I say, be used. Cætera corriget æquus Lector.

An impudent Papist THE
REVISOR'S
PREFACE.

 Seeing my Lord of Winton is pleased to wipe off that odious aspersi^{on} of his being a Papist [which might in the late conjuncture have cost him his civil, and endangered his natural life] by declaring not only his judgment in matters of Religion; but also the grounds, on which it relies, contained in several Treatises, long since compounded, but never till now made publick: I presume he will not be offended, that with the respect due to his quality of Peer of the Realm, these be reviewed. Reviewed, I say, for although Appellations lie only to higher, Revisions are committed to equal, or even inferiour Courts.

He protests, he is no Papist: and I think so too. I wish it were as easie to clear him of Calvinism: of which he owns pag. XII. that he hath been suspected, and to it he seems enclined when he says, "That God by Miracles promoted the Idolatrous Worship" of the Pictures, and Relicks of Saints. This I think in reality is to make God the Author of sin: Which Blasphemy I do not believe the Church of England will own, though it be a choice flower in Calvin's garden.

He declares his loyalty to the government established, and the Royal Family, &c. And I believe him in this also: nay I judge as favourably of the greatest part of his Rank, and moreover, that they are loyal not only for their Interest; but for
B conscience,

The Revisor's Preface.

conscience, and out of a sense of their duty to God, their Sovereign, & their Country: and that he, and they, will oppose, to their power, Schism in the Church, and Faction in the State. Yet I think all their endeavours will be ineffectual to prevent either, considering the constitution of the Protestant Church, and qualifications of its Clergy. For as in some natural Bodies there is a defect, which mangre all care of Physicians, cuts the thread of life, before it be spun to its ordinary length; so in some Bodies Politick, that of the English Protestant Church, in particular. Here are some reasons to prove this.

The first. Protestantism is a Schism, and those who live in it, live in a Schism. It is a Schism, because it is a party separated from the whole Catholick Church. Luther was a Schismatick, so was Calvin, so was Zuinglius, so was each Patriarch of your Reformation: for each of these at their first breaking forth, left the whole Catholick Church, or Congregation of Christians, of what denomination soever, not any one single Person in the whole world, to whom he (or they) did joyn himself. So that if ever any man was truly Schismatick, each one of these was such. Wherefore all who joyned to them, as all Protestants did, were Schismaticks. Now it is not probable that God will give that great Blessing of Ecclesiastical Peace to Schismaticks, who hate it, and oppose it.

My second is: Protestants are Hereticks, that is, Choosers of the points which they believe. For the Catholick Church delivered to her Children, not only what they believe; but also many Articles which they reject. Each Protestant takes this complex, examines it, and finding some Articles not to please him, he casts them out of his Creed. Hence one rejects the Real Presence; another, Free Will; A third, Merits; a fourth, the Possibility of keeping God's Commandments, &c. Each one culling out what Articles he pleases, and composing of them not a Catholick, but a Protestant Faith: not a Faith of the Gospels, but of this time, and their Phancies. What more evident signs of Hereticks? Now if they be such, can

The Revisor's Preface.

we think them fit instruments to oppose Heresie; who did introduce, and do still defend it? This shall be further confirmed by my fifth Reason.

My third. Protestants are a Cadmean Brood, they sprung out of the earth armed: and no sooner did their sovereign Lords see their faces, but they felt their Iron hands. Witness Germany, France, Hungary, Bohemia, Scotland, Swethland, Denmark, the Low-countries, and Geneva. Our English Protestants say, they are not concerned in these Rebellions: but that is not true, for by approving, and applauding them, they make them their own, and encourage the Practice, by commending the precedent. With what force can they teach Obedience to his Majesty, who praise Rebellion against other? Or divert men from Treason, who transform Traitors into Heroes, and canonize Regicides?

My fourth. There neither is, nor ever was any Authority under the Heavens better grounded than that of the Catholick Clergy, consisting of the Pope, and Bishops, was before the Reformation. It was established by Christ, settled by the Apostles, ratified by general, and particular Councils, confirmed by an uninterrupted Possession of almost fifteen hundred years, back'd by all Laws Ecclesiastical, and Civil, and acknowledged by all Christians then alive. What Gentleman can say so much for his Estate? What Officer, for his Authority? What King, for his Crown? What Parson, for his Tithe? What Protestant Bishop, for his Miter? When a Calvin, a Luther, &c. to say no more, private men, start up, declaim against that Clergy, as a humane invention, and an Antichristian establishment; and you applaud them, and with them tram under feet the whole sacred Order, and teach your Followers, no submission, no obedience is due to it. When you have taught them to break such Cables, can you expect to bind them to their duty with single threds?

The English Protestant pretence to Bishops doth not satisfy,
1. *Because in reality they had no Canonical Ordination, as we*

The Revisor's Preface.

say, and prove. 2. *Although they had imposition of hands, and were real Bishops [which we deny. See Anti-Haman, Chap. xxxv.] yet They entred not by the door; but climbed up some other way, John X. 1. Were not promoted according to any Canonical Form either ancient, or modern. Wherefore what can we judge of them, but according to Christs words, Loco citato?* 3. *Your first Protestants promoted their Religion, and spread their Novelties contrary to all even English Bishops, and in contempt of them, first in Henry VIII. his time, Tindale, and others. Secondly, in Q. Elizabeths time, when all the Bishops alive detested your Reformation, and were for that stript of their Jurisdiction, deposed from their Seats, and confined. What wonder then your Followers do not regard that Crozier, which you have broken, nor honour the Miter, which they have seen you trample under your feet? Lastly, suppose your Bishops were as validly, and canonically consecrated, as any ever were, can you say, that their Authority is berter grounded, than that of all the Catholick Clergy? Sure you cannot pretend to better grounds for your Authority, than our Clergy had. As it was then lawfull and laudable to three, or four private men to contradict our whole Clergy then in being, why may not some private men amongst you, withstand yours? What reason can you alledge against a Tub-preacher? Some Texts of Scripture? Canons of Councils? Tradition of the Church? Laws of the Realm? All these stood in favour of our Clergy against the first Reformers, as, and more, evidently than for you against your Dissenters. So your Schism and Reformation hath deprived you of all means to preserve the Peace of the Church.*

My fifth is taken from the manner of your Reformation. From Rome our Ancestors had received by the same hands a Systeme of Faith, a body of Ceremonies, and some Ecclesiastical Laws. The whole Faith as necessary to be believed, the Ceremonies as decent to entertain devotion. The Laws as convenient to Government, and Order. And your first Reformers

The Revisor's Preface.

formers changed all. In Faith they first rejected the whole unwritten Word, Tradition: and a great part of the written, Scripture. They secondly perverted many places of this, by new interpretations, retaining the word without its sense. The Ceremonies, and Laws were treated as licentious, throwing out of doors whatsoever they pleased. Now why may not another imitate these your Patriarchs? *Cur non licebit Valentiniano, quod licuit Valentino, de arbitrio suo fidem innovare?* What was lawful to Luther, is sure lawful to a Lutheran: and what was laudable in the sixteenth, is not a sin in the seventeenth Age, to give new interpretations to Scripture, abolish other Ceremonies, repeal more Canons. Especially the motives of reforming being common. Which is

My sixth. Your first Reformers rejected some Articles of Faith, as being delivered by fallible men: some Ceremonies as mens inventions, and some Laws as contrary to Evangelical liberty. Now all this holds as strongly against what they keep in, as what they leave out: for all Canons were imposed by men, all Ceremonies prescribed by men, and Scripture it self brought to you, and continued amongst you by fallible men, as much as the Real presence. Now as you blot this out of your Creed, why may not another strike out Baptism, a third the Trinity, a fourth the Incarnation, a fifth the Unity of God, a sixth the Deity it self? And so farewell all Faith. What reason is there, to say, that our Roman Missioners sent by S. Gregory were infallible in delivering the Mysteries of the Trinity or Incarnation, and fallible, in speaking of Purgatory, or the Real Presence? They say they pared away these Articles, because they were not from the beginning, and were abuses. But will not a Monothelit alledge the same against the distinction of Wills in Christ, an Eutychian, against the distinction of Natures, a Nestorian, against the Unity of Person in him, a Macedonian, against the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, an Arrian, against that of the Son, a Manichean, against the Unity of the Divine Nature, a Jew, against the New Testa-
ment,

The Revisor's Preface.

ment, and a Libertine, and Atheist, against both Old, and New, and God himself? These are not wire-drawn Conclusions, by obscure Mediums, and far fetched Illations; but natural, and obvious sequels of the fundamental Principles of your Reformation, which are inconsistent with any constancy in Faith, and settlement in Church Government. So I must conclude, that your Church building is such, as no Principles can bear; and your Principles are such, as can bear no building. By which we may guess, from whom your Reformers had their vocation, from Abaddon, Apollion, the Destroyer, seeing their Principles are good only to destroy Churches; not at all to build them.

In fine, a prudent man, without casting a figure, might have seen the fate of the late troubles, in their Principles, which were inconsistent with any settled Form of Civil Government, and would ruine them all successively, as they did, without any hopes of rest, unless these were laid aside, and the just, and ancient Government restored. The like conjecture may be made of Protestantism, its Principles being inconsistent with any settled form of Faith, and Church Government, will destroy them all by Schism and Heresies, and no probability of a settlement unless these be renounced, and the Ancient, Catholick, and Apostolical Faith, and Government restored. For a further proof of this, I appeal to experience, (which is a demonstration A posteriori, as the former is A priori) which is

My seventh. Experience shews, that it is much easier to destroy, than to settle a Government either in Church, or State. Nothing of Art, or Power was wanting to the establishment of the Prelatical Church in England. She appeared first with the plausible colours of an Apostolical Reformation, was cherished by Royal favour, armed with the severest Laws imaginable. Tet one Age had not pass'd over her head, when the peccant humours bread within her, laid her in the dust, and the Crown it self with her, which it was hoped she would uphold.

The Revisor's Preface.

bold. Both were again restored: yet how soon was the joy of that over, and both brought again into a like danger? Seek no where abroad the spring of these mischiefs, they rise from the Reformation, and are inseparable from the Protestant Church.

My eighth, and last reason is drawn from the Protestane Clergy, it self, which as it is modelled, and principled, can never sufficiently influence the Nation to preserve its Union in the Worship of God, and its duty to the King: to prevent Schism in the Church, and Faction in the State. This appears by experience. The reasons I reserve till some further occasion be given.

3. D. M. (so we shall hereafter call my Lord of Winton) says in his Preface pag. II. A French Jesuit called Mainbourg publish'd something as witten by her late R. H. and he repeats afterwards four times in the Preface, and once in his Postscript Mainbourg the Jesuit: when it was Mainbourg the secular Priest who Printed it. Which that Book of his tells all the world, so did the publick Gazetts, containing his dismission out of the Society. His superiours did never permit him to print it, whilst he was a Jesuit, knowing how sacred the secrets of Princes ought to be. So that Paper crept about only in written Copies, seen by few, and of these not many believing it to be hers, whose name it bears. Now D. M. hath spread it, and the rumour of her Change in Religion, for his own vindication, and so prejudiced his Mother the Church of England: for I doubt not but her R. H. example will move more Powerfully to leave that Church, than D. M. S. judgment, to retain men in it.

He questions the Conference between her R. H. and the Bishop: which being a matter of Fact, must rely on the deposition of Witnesses, and their credit, and interest. She is positive, he conjectural: she had no motive, but Truth; he concerned for the honour of his Church, and his own. His Topick is, if the Bishop answered so; he was neither so Learned, nor Conscientious,

The Revisor's Preface.

scientious, nor Prudent, as he ought to be. Which many will eaiser grant, than that her R. H. in a matter of fact would wittingly tell an untruth.

Herelates many things in his Preface to little purpose. v, c. His coming out of England with 130 l. and returning with as much, (as if he had the blessing of the Israelites in the Desert, whose Cloths did not wear out) his serving his Majesty, and the Queen of Bohemia, without putting them to any charge, but his diet, his Catechising their Servants, and preaching to them, his journey to Collen, and return to the Hague, &c. what is the Publick concerned in all this? Unless it be to help an Historian to write his Life. But of heroical men even the Cradles, Battles, and Hobby horses are venerable.

Page viii. He says, he did not converse with the French Hugonots, because if They did not encourage, yet they did not, at least had not, condemned the rebellious proceedings of their Presbyterian Brethren in England against the King and Church. Which implies only their being idle spectators of that Tragedy, in which many think they were Actors for the worse side: and many English women in Geneva, who followed their Husbands thither at the end of the Wars, were proof enough. I will relate here what I find in Grotius his *Discussio Riveriani Apostolici*, pag. 88, and 89. where having said, that the publick Peace is disturbed by that Doctrine: *Licita esse pro Religione subditorum in Reges arma*, he adds: *Hoc vir nobilissimus Plessiacus Mornæus, tanquam pietati consentaneum, testamento etiam suo inseruit.* Hinc ille motus Ambaxianus, cum reformatus Renauderius quosdam sui similes in privatum conclave convocasset, & dedisset eis potestatem Ordinum Regni. Hinc Bezæ conciones pro classico. Hinc Rupellensis Conventus impudentia, qui omnes in Regno Pontificios, deinde etiam Reformatos, Regis auctoritatem sequentes, declaravit ab honoribus omnibus, muneribusque publicis dimovendos: præfecturas autem per omne Regnum distribuit, quibus voluit: talium consiliorum

The Revisor's Preface.

consiliorum auctorem sibi fuisse PETRUM MOLINEUM testatur Theophilus Mileterius, vir nobilis, & illis, qui reformatos se dicunt, optime volens. *Thus he. This Book hath been Printed near these forty years: and never any thing alledged against these matters of fact, that I could hear of. How will Monsieur du Moulin Prebend of Canterbury reconcile with this Counsel of his Father, that Letter, which he printed in his Fathers name?*

4. These Treatises, having been composed on emergent occasions, without any settled design, have no other order than that of the time they were composed in, amongst those of the same language. I designed once to draw the matters handled in them into some method; which would help to their understanding. But because that would make my Answer to D. M. less satisfactory (a thing mainly aimed at) I took the easier way, to follow my Author, as he leads me, step by step, without omitting any thing material. I omit in my Revision the Letters of the Regular Priest, as not grounding the judgment, in matters of Religion, of D. M. as also D. M. his Letter to Trigland, as containing nothing to our purpose. For it treats only two points: The first of Fact, that his Majesty really was a Protestant. To which no Answer is necessary. The second of Policy, that his Majesty was to be restored to his Crown by an Army of the States. To this I cannot answer, as never having commenced Batchelour in Policy. Yet I will say, that God himself found a way to restore his Majesty, and put an end to the troubles of the State, without Arms (contrary to the expectation of D. M.) And I hope [at least it long hath been, is, and shall be my constant Prayer] that the God of Peace put an end to these contentious disputes in the Church; that we all may come to compose but One sheepfold, under One shepherd, John X. 16. I thought once to omit his Letter against Father Cressley, as being chiefly personal: yet finding besides a too severe charge on him, some Reflections upon his whole holy Order, I took leave to review the

C

grounds

The Revisor's Preface.

grounds of both, yet pass it lightly, as entering upon it unwillingly.

That the Reader may with less trouble see what the Doctor says, and to what I answer, I give his own words, commonly at large, at least their full sense: and I mark the page, where they are to be found. This makes my Revision somewhat longer: but that is compensated with the ease of discovering the Truth, which both sides pretend to, but only one side contends for sincerely, the other opposes with all his Power. God grant to all a sincere love of Peace, and Church Union: and then all these disputes will cease.

Postscript. What is contained in my fourth Book, pag. 111. that Factionous men were proficient in the Art of promoting mischief, was written in march last, 1683. I little dreamed to see my conjecture confirmed so soon in such a notorious manner, as it was by The Rye Plot, and Blunderbusses. God hath miraculously both disappointed, and discovered these Ruffians: I beseech him, to grant, that the Root, [at least the pretext, or occasion] of all these traiterous Practices, The hatred of innocent men, and loyal Subjects, may cease.

THE
Revision Revised.

by an honest Protestant of the Church of England.

The REPLY to L. W.'s Preface.

MR. REVISOR,

FOR by that Name I shall think fit, for want of a better, at present to call you. You are in the right, when you say that the intent of my Lord of WINTON, in his late Publication of those several Treatises, which had been written by him upon several occasions concerning the Church of Rome, and most of the Doctrines controverted betwixt Her and the Church of England, was to wipe off that odious aspersi^on (as you call it) which had been cast upon him by the Author of *Elmas the Sorcerer*, of his being a *Papist*, or Possibly inclin'd. But this was not (as you cunningly intimate) to avoid any danger, which that Pamphlet might have created him, either in his *Civil*, or in his *Natural* Capacity: For he could not be under any such apprehen-

sion, since the very worst of his Enemies, (the very Libeller himself not excepted) did not, I am confident, believe any such thing of him. Only finding in that Book two of our *English Bishops* concern'd in a passage taken out of *Mainbourg*, and being conscious to himself of his own Personal integrity, and Zealous as became him for the Dignity of his Order, he judg'd that the best way of vindicating himself, and taking off that reproach, would be to manifest to the world, by Publishing those Writings of his, what his Judgment ever had been all along from first to last. Nor doth he, as you would have it believ'd, lay down all those Grounds, upon which this Judgment of his is bottom'd; but such only *pro hic & nunc*, as the present occasion, and the matter in hand, and other circumstances of his Writing required. For without doubt, had his Lordship design'd a complete System of *Controversie*, he had infinitely much more to have said, and far other, and I hope I may have his leave to say greater and more strenuous Reasons and Arguments to back that his Judgment withal; tho' *these* also in their kind and place, as to the Occasions upon which they were severally written, are sufficient for the conviction of any one, who will govern himself, as a Christian ought to do, by the Authority and Reason of *Scripture*. At least they are sufficient for that which was the only Cause and End of his publishing them; which was merely to vindicate himself from the suspicion of being a *Papist*, or of having had any hand in perverting her late R. H. (if she were perverted) in her Religion.

Well, Sir, I must needs say that you enter the Lists (whatever you may be) like a fair Adversary: For your words are these, in the first Paragraph of your Preface; I wish you had been so just to your self, as to have kept to that Principle, and made good your promise in the rest of your Discourse. I presume, say you, He (my Lord of

of Winton) will not be offended, that, with the respect due to his Quality of Peer of the Realm, these Grounds of his be reviewed. These words, I must acknowledge, do bespeak a Gentleman, and a Religious Person; and no ingenuous Reader but would imagine, that the Writer of them laid himself under an obligation of shewing that due respect; wherein yet God and your own Conscience knows, and all the World may take notice, how far you have been from acquitting your self as a Man of Honour, that regards his Word, ought to have done. So true is it what the Italians say, *A ditto al fatto è gran tratto*; *Saying and Doing are two things*. Nor do I know how any of your Friends can excuse that Raillery and rudeness, that irreverent, immodest, and intemperate Language, wherewith you treat this Right Reverend Person, and Right Honourable too, as Peer of the Realm. I say I do not see how they can excuse you, unless they will fly to that fam'd Rule of yours, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, nor Good Manners, it seems, to be used towards them, and that Zeal (which is the Fanatick Doctrine and Practice as well as yours) is a very fair plea for the most rude and uncivil behaviour. Put the case now, that you were Indicted for *Scandalum Magnatum*, as your Book would, peradventure, afford matter enough for such a Charge; I do believe it might go a little hard with you, and your Twelve Godfathers would scarce accept of that Plea, that the fierceness of your Zeal raised your Passion, and sharpened your Expression. This, Sir, is said *En Passant*; for such is the Christian Temper of the Good Bishop, that you are, as to him, in no danger of the Law, I dare almost assure you; and that all the return he desireth should be made to your uncivil treatment, should be St. Michael's answer, as St. Jude hath set it down, Verse the 9th of his Epistle. As to my self, who have taken up the *revs. p.* Cudgels, (it is your own expression) it is a rude

Spont

The Revision Revised.

sport you know, and the *Bishop* for his Age and Dignity may be very well excused. We that are younger men may have a brush, and shake hands when we have done, and be as much *Friends* or *Strangers* as ever we were. I am not for breaking of Pates or Shins, if I can help it, or knocking of Elbows and the like; and therefore am purposed through all the way that I am to attend you, to maintain as pleasant a conversation with you as I can, that I may make my Task as easie, and my performance as inoffensive as may be. To go on then; for we are yet but upon the threshold.

Your learned distinction of *Revision* and *Appellation* you might have spared; only that you would seem to shew that *due respect* you speak of, to a *Peer of the Realm*, in giving your Book that Title. But as to strict propriety of speech, considering how you have managed this your *Revision*, you might as well have called it an *Inquisition* against a *Heresick Bishop*, or a *Lampoon* in prose upon a *Peer of the Realm*: And yet you may be sure the *Bishop* or *Peer*, who is the injur'd Person, will not make his *Appellation* to *Rome*; That neither the Law of the Land nor his own Conscience will give him leave to do.

You say *He* (the *Bishop*) *protests he is no Papist, and I think so too*, say you. I do not find any where, that the *Bishop* in his whole Book *protests* he is no *Papist*: There was no need for his protesting it. *Res ipsa loquitur*. His Book it self is a sufficient *Protestation*, and had he not writ *That*, his whole *Life* had been enough to satisfy the World: and to say no more, the solemn Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*, which every good Subject takes, and his Lordship hath often taken, are much more than *Protestations*. But we will not quarrel innocent mistakes; especially when they are back'd with such civility: For you say, *you think so too*. This we must own
for

for a favour, and it is the only favour that the *Bishop* expected or desired from you, or from any other *Reader*. It was the main and only *End*, why he published those *Treatises*, that the World might be convinced that he was no *Papist*. And you, Sir, (what thanks shall we return you?) out of your superabundant civility, thinking it not enough only to think him to be no *Papist*, have for his farther Vindication written in his behalf; that is, you have given an undeniable Evidence that he is no *Papist*; by Writing against him for his not being one, and treating him in that manner, as no Christian, but a *Romanist* or a *Fanatick*; would treat another. But Sir, what need had you, when the *Bishop* had done the business himself before, to intermeddle, and give your self the trouble of this kind office? This

Vid. The
Bishop's
own Post-
script.

sure was a work of *Supererogation*, not only in one part of the Undertaking (as you your self own) but in the whole of it: For what man of business (as you say you are) would so impertinently squander away his time, and mispend his little

Revis. p.
82.

p. 82.

leisure from other employments, as *Actum agere*, to engage in unnecessary imploy, and do over again what has been done already to his hands? But such is the *elasticity* and *springiness* of some mens airy nature and brisk parts, (I use your own learned terms) that the least pressure, the smallest apprehension invigorates them, and sets them on fermentation. So much for your *Civility*, of which I have made the larger acknowledgments, because we are like to meet with no more of it. The very next step you make is a foul stumble, and a clear proof of that *rudeness* which runs through all the veins of all your following discourse.

After you had said that you think him to be no *Papist*, you wish in the very next breath, it were as easie to clear him of *Calvinism*. Why, man? May not one be no *Papist* and yet no *Calvinist* neither? Is there no *medium* betwixt these

these

these two? Or may not one be a *Calvinist* and a *Papist* too? For what are your *Jansenists* but *Calvinists* in Doctrine? And did not *Bradwardine* the profound, and *Robert Holcot*, our own Countrymen, besides several others of your *Schoolmen*, hold much what the same Opinion as *Calvin* did in the Doctrine of *Decrees*, and say as much upon it as ever he did? Besides you are mistaken in the notion of *Calvinism*, I perceive, as the *Bishop* himself, had you read his Vindication against Mr. *Baxter*, would have informed you; where he tells you that *Calvinism* is not the Doctrine which *Calvin* taught; for that was own'd by *St. Augustine*, and several others, long before *Calvin* was born; but that Novel Discipline and *Presbyterial* Government without *Bishops*, which was set up by *Calvin*, and had never been practis'd, or countenanc'd, or thought of in the World for 1500 years after Christ till *Calvin's* time. And I think his Lordship hath given a clear and satisfactory account of himself, in his *Preface* to these Treatises (which yon pretend to review) as a man could give, that he hath been, and is still as far from being a *Calvinist* in this sense, as he ever was, and is from being a *Papist*.

But how doth it appear that he is a *Calvinist* in any sense? Why! Pag. 12. of that *Preface* he owns, you say, That he had been *suspected*: But I hope *Suspicion* doth not prove a *Guilt*; nor do my young eyes read in that *Page*, that he owns any such thing: You might perhaps read with some sort of Spectacles, that might disguise the Print. He saith indeed this, that *There is one that saith it, and saith it in Print, and, saith the Bishop, I presume will stand by it (because he owns himself to be the Author of it, meaning Elymas the Sorcerer, by setting his Name to it) that I disguise my being a Papist in my heart, by seeming a rigid Calvinist by profession.* What is the single malicious suggestion of a paultry Pamphleteer, to prove that which you

you would have to be thought a *common* *suspicion* ? But you have a better help at maw. You would prove it from himself: For you say, *He seems inclined, when he says that God by miracles promoted the Idolatrous Worship of the Pictures, and Relicks of Saints.* I do confess should any one say so, without any limitation or distinction, as if God should *designedly* promote Idolatrous Worship, it would have been a very ill saying, and next door to *Blasphemy*; but yet I don't see any force it has to prove the Charge, that he that should say so, would therefore be a *Calvinist*. Why! this is you think *in reality to make God the Author of Sin*: What then? Doth *Calvin* make him so? Doth he ever in exprefs terms say any such thing? Not in any of his Writings that ever I could hear of. *This Blasphemy*, you say, *you don't believe the Church of England will own*; (thank you for that) *though it be*, you say, *a choice Flower in Calvin's Garden.* And what is the meaning of this, but to make the *Bishop* odious to the Church of *England-mer*, by that plausible saying, that you do not believe the Church of *England* will own such a *Blasphemy*, as you would have it believed you do by fair consequence draw from an assertion of his, and so making him a *Calvinist*? Though that which you call a *Flower*, is indeed an abominable *Weed*, which was never planted by *Calvin* himself, but by forc'd consequences (as you witty men are never wanting at such things) has been impos'd upon him. Supposing then that the *Bishop* did say as you have made him here to say, that *God by miracles promoted Idolatrous Worship*, he doth not say, or at least doth not mean, that God wrought those Miracles to that end; but that those Miracles were *per accidens*, beside Gods intention, and yet by his permission, through the craft of the Devil, and the ignorance or wickedness of men, they were, I say, and were so by God permitted to be, the *occasions* of promoting Idolatry. And what is this to the making of God

the *Author of Sin*, any more than those Thefts, Murders, Adulteries, and other sins, which are daily committed by men and permitted by God? But what if after all this, the *Bishop* did not say what you have reported him to have said? For it is in the *Latin* part whence these words are quoted, pag. 22, 23. I shall, for the Readers satisfaction, to shew him what fair play we are to expect from such Gamesters, set down the Bishops sence in his own words at large, only rendring them into *English*. Having spoken of the Heathen Worship of *Dæmons* before Christianity, he goeth on thus. *But, saith he, after that upon the rising of the Sun of our Righteousness, these shades of Dæmons or Devils began to disappear and vanish out of sight, and the Most High God began to be known after a truer manner, and to be worshipt after a more holy manner, by most People of the World, than ever he had been before, upon the discovery of that alone Mediator betwixt God and man, viz. Christ, who is God and Man; then the old crafty Broker (meaning the Devil) laying the Serpent aside for a time, put on the Lyon, and turning himself from Craft to Rage, those whom he saw to remain of the Dæmon-worshippers, he stirred up with sword and fire to persecute the true Servants of the One God, and the One Mediator, that they might not be at all, who would be no longer his (at his Devotion.) But when in process of time, this course had not that success as he would have had it, but he saw that the Blood of the Martyrs was the Seed of the Church, he again turned about to his old tricks and ways of cheat, and when he took notice that at the Relicks of Martyrs, People said their Prayers and built Oratories (or Chappels and Churches,) and that sometimes Miracles also were shewn by God at such places; he bethought himself how he might out of that very Blood of the Martyrs, which had been the Seed of the Church, make a Harvest for his own advantage, and the use of his Synagogue, which he looked he should have in the very Church of God. Wherefore*
that

that he might with the more ease abuse the unwary simplicity of pious minds, he procured first that those Orizons and Prayers which were made at the Memories of the Martyrs, might be believed to be more acceptable to God, than if they had been made any where else. Afterward, when any thing that was considerable, and beyond the hope and expectation of those people that prayed at such places, was obtained by Prayer, then that Enemy of Mankind procured also, that that benefit, whatever it were, should be imputed and ascribed net wholly to God, but in some part to the Martyr, or at least to the Martyrs favour and merits which he had with God. And that he might the deeper fasten and root such a perswasion in the Minds of men, he did either by false Miracles in those places, feigned by himself, or even by true ones wrought by God, but to another end and purpose, though by him (the Devil) wrested to other intent than God meant them; he did, I say, so cherish and improve this natural propension and forwardness of men to Superstition; that they who at first were wont to call upon God alone at the memories of the Martyrs, did at length address their Prayers to the Martyrs themselves, as those without whose aid and suffrage they did believe nothing could be obtained at Gods hands. Now in as much as all Confessors are Martyrs in voto, in vow and resolution, and all that are truly Saints are, either in act or in vow, Confessors, and by this means the case is the same as to all deceased persons, who by the Judgment of the Church are to pass for Saints, and the account of Angels stands yet upon a much better foot; thereupon it was that the Invocation both of Angels and of all Saints, did at length obtain and grew into fashion and custom. And thus the Ancient Dæmon-worship of both kinds used amongst the Gentiles, was under other Names, viz. of Angels and Saints, but under the same pretence of humility, restor'd and entertain'd by the Christians, or rather by Anti-christ obtruded and impos'd upon Christians. This is a true and faithful account of the Bishops fence, word for word,

as near as I could give it, as the Reader himself may see, by comparing; where he doth plainly and expressly affirm that those *true Miracles* which were wrought at the Memories of the *Martyrs*, were indeed wrought by God, but *in alium finem*, to another end than to promote Idolatry; however by the Devil they were *alioquin detorta*, wrested and applyed to ill purpose, and to another end than God designed them. Now let the Reader judge between the Bishop and You, the Lord of Winton, and L. W. whether you have fairly represented him to say, that God by Miracles promoted the Idolatrous Worship of the Pictures, and Reliques of Saints, and thus, *in reality*, (as you say) to make God the Author of Sin: Whereas the Bishop only shews, and gives a very probable account, which may also, I presume, be confirmed by Ecclesiastical History, how the *Demon-worship*, which had been practised amongst the Heathens, was by degrees in time, through the craft and cunning of the Devil, brought into the Christian Church, and whence the *Invocation of Saints and Angels* had its rise. But to do My Lord, and You, and the Reader a greater justice, it will not be amiss to take notice of the passage, as you have curtail'd and alter'd it in the 97, and 98 Pages of your *Latin*, where you pretend to quote these words of Dr. Morley. Thus you set them down: *After that upon the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, these shades of Demons began to disappear and vanish out of sight, and the Most High God began to be worshipped after a more holy manner, upon the discovery of the only Mediator between him and us, the Devil put on the Lyon, and stirr'd up his Worshipers with Sword and Fire to persecute the Servants of God.* But when thereupon he perceived the number of believers, or the faithful to be increased, in as much as the blood of Christians proved to be the seed of the Church; he turning himself to his old tricks of cheat, bethought himself how he might make a Harvest for himself therefrom, by persuading
simple

simple persons, that the Prayers which were made at the Memories of the Martyrs, were more acceptable to God : Which opinion the Miracles there done did promote. From whence by degrees it was brought about, that Martyrs, and afterward Confessors, were admitted as Mediators betwixt God and men. This is your recital, which with what fidelity and sincerity you have done, I leave to the candid Reader to judge; in that you have left out the Bishop's distinction, and in other parts of the passage have not kept exactly to the Text. But your own descant which you have made upon the Bishop, will excuse me from making that reflection I might upon you : For your answer to this is, I do not wonder, say you, that you being one of Calvin's Disciples, should say that God by Miracles promoted an opinion, which the Devil had sown in the minds of Men, (a thing which the Bishop is so far from saying, that he utterly detesteth it; but it is you that say it for him, and pretend he says it) when, say you, I know that your Master says that God is the Author of Sin. If Calvin doth any where say so, you should have done well to have made good your charge, by naming the place; but I do challenge you to shew where in any, or all of his Writings, he hath said so : Yet, say you, I hope that with all equal Judges the Authority of God, for the confirmation of that Opinion, cherishing it with Miracles, will be of more force than your assertion affirming it to have sprang from the Devil, can be for the overthrowing of it. But whence (say you to the Bishop) have you such an insight into the Devils designs? Have you eaten a Bushel of Salt with him, as the Patriarch of your upstart Reformation boasted he had done? By what Authority do you say these things? None. What Witness have you? No body but your self. You must show that there has a great Familiarity past betwixt you and him, that you may persuade us that you are so well acquainted with his Intrigues, the secrets of his Heart; which if you do not do, scarce any
body

body will believe you; nor will it be enough for you to inform us that he hath told you these things, unless over and above, you your self pass your Word, and be Security for his Truth, who is a Lye, and the Father of Lyes. This is your Language, and a great deal more of such stuff, of the like virulent nature, you utter up and down throughout that whole *Latin* Treatise, which none but He you mention'd last could suggest to you, and no Christian can read without horror and abhorrence: So that to translate your *Latin* would be to confute it, and there would need no more for the Vindication of the *Bishop*, than to expose (I mean to expound) his Adversary. But what shall we say? There is a sort of *Sophisters*, who, even in the cause of Religion, for want of better Argumentation and Plea, are neither afraid nor asham'd (and it should seem by this one instance, if there were no more, that your parts lye somewhat that way) to make Lying their *Logick*, and Railing their *Rhetorick*: For doth it not now appear to any indifferent, unprejudic'd Reader, to be a gross Untruth, which you charge the *Bishop* with, that he should say that God by Miracles promoted the Idolatrous Worship of the *Pictures*, and Relicks of Saints; when he says no such thing, nor any thing like it, nay expressly affirms the contrary, that the true Miracles which were wrought at the Memories of the *Martyrs*, were intended by God to another end, but the Devil took advantage of them to other purpose than God design'd them. And what is Railery, if this be not in the highest? I mean your Answer to what you say (though untruly say it) the *Bishop* said, which no rational modest man can conclude to be other than a disingenuous (another man that were as Zealous as you, would say a Diabolical) gloss upon an innocent Text. I have insisted the longer upon this Instance, because you have pleased to place this calumny of Calvinism in the very Front of your Preface, and it is that which (as I noted before) makes

makes up a very considerable part in your *Latin Treatise*. Yet we are beholden to you, that you say *you don't believe, the Church of England* (as bad as it is you mean) *would own the Blasphemy of making God the Author of Sin, though it be a choice Flower in Calvin's Garden.* But what will you say, if as there are some in the Church of Rome (as I have already told you there are, and have been) so in the Church of *England* also, as by Law established, (for we own no other Church of *England* than such) there are likewise some pious and learned Persons, that are in their Judgment *Calvinists*, that is, of the same opinion as *Calvin* was concerning Gods Decrees: Certainly those pious and learned Persons, on the one side and the other, will absolutely deny, and utterly abhor, that hellish consequence, that therefore God is the *Author of Sin*. It is true, that our Church of *England* hath used that moderation and prudence, in those *Articles* of Religion that concern *Predestination* (which it had been happy for you, and perhaps for all Christendom, had your Fathers of *Trent* used the like) that she hath not interposed her Authority to determine one way or other, but hath left it free for her Sons and Children to follow their own judgment, provided they modestly make use of that freedom, and do not by difference of opinion, and an ill-temper'd Zeal for the maintaining of their own Sentiments, divide the Unity, and disturb the Peace of the Church.

I have done with this business of *Calvinism* once for all, and I deserve your and the Readers pardon for my being thus tedious now, because though you will give me frequent occasion as I go along, yet I will take no farther notice, nor make any more mention of it. You are now fetching a large Jump to the very bottom and end of the *Bishop's Preface*, where he doth declare and profess himself to be *A true Son of the*

Bishop's
Preface, p.
15.

Church

Church of England, as it is established by Law, a Loyal, Faithful, and Obedient Subject to the King, a hater of Schism in the Church, and Faction in the State. You do believe the Bishop in this his Declaration, nay and you judge as favourably of the greatest part of his rank: Mr. Revisor, This is extraordinary from you, for it is civil; But the ill luck on't is, you never are so without a design of being otherwise, and you do as Physicians are wont to do, guild over your bitter Pills that they may go down the better. I use this expression the rather, because turning over the leaf, I find you setting up for a State-Empirick: You say that you believe that He and the other Bishops (that is, those of them whom you have that favourable opinion for) will oppose to their power Schism in the Church, and Faction in the State; yet you think all their endeavours will be ineffectual. Why? What is the matter? Here you deliver your Judgment like a Doctor: For, say you, as in some Natural Bodies there is a defect, which mangle all care of Physicians, cuts the Thread of Life before it be spun to its ordinary length; so in some Bodies Politick, that of the English Protestant Church in particular. What? Then Dr. you give us up for lost? Nay Sir, if you have given us over, our condition, it seems, is desperate. What great pity it is, that at the Restitution of the King and Church, we had not you in consultation? But speak truly Sir, Do you tell us our danger out of kindness, and a desire that we may prevent and recover? Or do you do it to insult and triumph over us? I assure, that's your meaning. A man of your parts could not be content to encounter a single Bishop: the whole English Protestant Church is Quarry little enough for such a high Flyer. I confess, Mr. Revisor, when I first read this digression of yours, wherein you strike at our Church, Root and Branch, and truly I think by consequence the State too; I was amazed at your Heedless Confidence, that according to the Pro-

verb,

verb; *Capra nondum peperit, & hœdus ludit in tecto*; Before the Dam had year'd the frisking Kid should be got on the top of the house. You say indeed in your Title Page, that your Book was printed *Permissu Superiorum*. I will not stand to question the Authority and discretion of your *Superiours*, that gave you leave to Print; but I do verily believe, that if you had ask'd the advice of your *Friends*, as well as the leave of your *Superiors*, you would not have published this passage at least. For here for *five Pages* together you bring in a business, that is utterly forreign and impertinent to your undertaking, and fall foul upon the whole *constitution* of the *Church*, whilst you pretend only to have to do with a single *Dr.* of it, as you make him. For so you say that *considering the constitution of the Protestant Church, (that of the English Protestant Church in particular) and the qualifications of its Clergy, all endeavours that can be used will be ineffectual to prevent either Schism in the Church, or Faction in the State.* If so, then farewell *English Government!* then old *England*, thou must go to Pot; thy fate like *Atropos* stands ready to cut thy vital threads. However *Mr. Revisor*, though your *Patient* be desperate, you are not to go without your *Fee*. I perceive, if we mean to be safe we must alter our *constitution*. Ay but that is not every bodies business to do. Why did you not address your advice to the *King and Council*, or to a *Parliament*? it is properly their business to look after the publick: I suppose you are so well acquainted with the *English Laws* as to know what a *Premunire* means; and I believe being a *Scholar*, as you are, you have read that it was an order among the *Locrians* (I take it) that whosoever came to propose the repealing of an old *Law* or *constitution*, and the setting up of a new one, was to do it with the ceremony of a rope about his neck; and you have heard, I do not question, how lately in *Scotland*, by his R. H's conduct

a *Law* hath been made and a *Test* provided to secure the government both of *Church* and *State* there in that Kingdom; And that his R. H. will be as ready to give his consent and assistance for making the like *Law* and *Test*

Bishops
Vindic. a-
gainst Mr.
Baxter, p.
444.

here in *England* for our security also; the *Bishop* himself, in that Book of his I before commended to you against Mr. *Baxter*, tells us that he doth verily believe, and saith that all reasonable men have reason to believe he will. All this put together, makes me in great probability believe, that you did not publish this impertinence of five *Pages*, (wherein you pretend at once to overthrow the *Church* and *State* of *England*) advisedly, that is, by the advice of your Friends, and that none of your Friends will think they have reason to thank you for your pains. Whatever the thing is, though it doth not stand upon advice, it is trespas'd up with eight *Reasons*: And why but eight? Why not nineteen? Why not at least ten, as your Brother *Campion* had before you? I will have the patience for once to go along with you and attend your *Reasons*, which if I do shew either to be false, or alike to affect the Church of *Rome*, as you say they do the Church of *England*, will, I suppose, appear to be no *Reasons*.

Your first Reason is, that *Protestancy* is a *Schism*, and it is not probable, you say, that God will give that great blessing of Ecclesiastical Peace to *Schismatics*, who hate and oppose it. And how do you prove it is a *Schism*? Why you say it is a *Schism*, because it is a *Party* separated from the whole *Catholic Church*, that is, as you explain your self, from the whole *Congregation of Christians*, of what denomination soever. By the way I thank you for that. There are, it seems, two sorts of *Catholic Church*; the *Roman-Catholic Church*, and the whole *Catholic Church*. If it be so, then we are safe enough; we are sure to be of the one

OR

or the other of them. I confess, I do not think the distinction to be *Scholastick* or *Proper* : For with me, the whole Church, that is, the *Universal Church*, and the *Catholic Church* is all one, whole being but the English for *Universal*, as that is the Latin for *Catholic* ; so that all three words signifie the same thing ; and to say the *Roman-Catholic Church*, or the *Roman-Catholic Religion*, as your people usually do, doth to me imply a contradiction, as much as to say a *particular Universal*. But this being a favour, which you, whether of your Grace, or unwittingly, have dropt to our advantage, we ought not to neglect it, but to make as much as we can of it. The whole Church then by your own confession, is not bounded within the *Roman* jurisdiction, so that *Protestants* though they are separated from the *Roman-Catholic Church*, are not therefore separated from the whole *Catholic Church* ; but do themselves make as considerable a part (if not more) of the whole *Catholic Church*, as the *Roman Catholic Church* it self doth. For it is plain by your expression, that you do grant some Churches, that are not under the *Roman* Jurisdiction, to make up the whole *Catholic Church*, by your saying *Christians of what denomination soever*. As for example, the *Abassines*, *Coptites*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, *Russians*, &c. and why not then by parity of Reason, *Germans*, *Switzers*, *Hungarians*, *Swedes*, *Danes*, *French*, *Dutch*, *English*, and *Scotch Protestants* ? And it is pretty what you say of *Luther*, *Calvin*, and *Zuinglius*, and so of each *Patriarch*, as you call it, of the *Reformation* ; though I know no reason you have to tell us of them : We had nothing to do with any of them in our *Reformation*, and *Habent atatem*, they (I mean those Countries and Churches, who followed them) are old enough to answer for themselves. You say there was not any one single Person in the whole world, to whom any of them did joyn himself ; so that upon this account, each one

of them was a *Schismatick*. Wherefore, say you again, *all who joyned to them, as all Protestants did, were Schismatics*. But for Gods sake, if *all Protestants* joyn'd to them, did not they joyn to *all Protestants*? For *joyning* is a mutual reciprocal action. How then could you say that there was *not any one single Person in the World, to whom any one of them did joyn himself*, and yet immediately after say, that *all Protestants* joyned with them, meaning, as you must, the People of those Countries you reckon up in your *third Reason*, to wit, *Germany, France, Hungary, Bohemia, Scotland, Swethland, Denmark, the Low-Countries, and Geneva*. To return the *Argument* upon you, for it will stand as well that way, *Popery* is a *Schism*, and those that live in it live in *Schism*. It is a *Schism*, because it is a *Party separated from the whole Catholick Church*, that is, from *all other Christians of what denomination soever*, that is, from *all that are not Papists*. To read the *Riddle*, the *Fallacy* of this *Argument* lyeth in this, that the *part* of any thing, as it is actually separated from *all the other parts*; so being considered apart by it self, and abstractively, may be said to be separated from the *whole* also: Especially if we take these *other parts*, to which that *part* is contradistinguished (as you do) to be the *whole*; which is very improper to do; since the *whole* is not made up of *this* or *that* part, of *some* or *many* parts, or of *all* its parts *save one*, which ever it be, but of *all* its parts together, as here in the present case, 'tis not the *Papists* alone (as some of your *Doctors* have born the world in hand,) nor they with some others, (excluding *Protestants*, as you in your way of reasoning would here do) but 'tis *all Christians, Protestants* and all, that make up the *Catholick Church*; for so you have taught us here, that by the *whole Catholick Church*, (you might have left out *whole, Catholick* had been enough) is to be understood, the *Congregation of Christians, of what denomination soever*.

Your

Your second Reason is, that Protestants are Hereticks, that is, *chusers of the points which they believe*. This is a notable description of a Heretick, from the Greek Etymon of the word. But Sir, though your Church be *infallible*, don't you *chuse* to believe her? Or do you believe her, because you cannot *chuse* but believe her? If so, for ought I see, you are your self a Calvinist, by fancying (if you do so fancy) you were predestin'd to be a Romanist. But surely you and all Catholics are as great Hereticks, for this reason, as you make us to be: For you have been *chusers* of more points which you believe, than we have been; and that in despite of Sense, Reason, Scripture, Fathers, &c. As Transubstantiation, Infallibility, the Pope's Supremacy, Communion under one kind, Image-worship, &c.

But the truth of it is, these two Reasons of yours are loose in the Hilt: For you suppose that Heresie and Schism are things of themselves destructive to Church and State; and then you take for grant, that Protestantism is Heresie and Schism. Now we, as we disavow your Assumption, having only reform'd from the corruptions of Doctrines, and the Superstitions of Worship, which you still retain in your Church; so we may with as much probability deny your Major Proposition, as you affirm it. For whereas your Reader might have expected demonstration from you, you bring in your Conclusion of your first Argument with this soft term, *That it is not probable that God will give the Blessing of Peace to Schismatics (and Hereticks)* such as you take us to be; though we, notwithstanding your reproaches, are contented with St. Paul, to ^{Acts 25.} 14. serve the God of our Fathers in that way which you call Heresie. You say it is not probable God will give Peace to such; that is, you mean it is probable that he will not give Peace, or at least not continue it to such. Now to disprove this, I say it is evident that God doth give Peace,

Peace, and as much peace in those which you call *Schismatical* and *Heretical* Kingdoms and Countries, as he doth in the *Catholick* Dominions; and it is as *probable* on the one side as well as on the other, that he will so *continue* it. For do not, have not the Dukes of *Brandenburg* and *Saxony*, and the Prince *Palatine* in *Germany*, and their Subjects, enjoyed as much *Peace* at home among themselves, as any of the *Catholick* Princes and their Subjects in *Germany* have done? Do not, have not the two Northern Kings of *Denmark* and *Sweedland* liv'd as quietly by one another, as ever the *Catholick* and *Most Christian* Kings have done? And why may not they do so still? So that your *probability* hath spoil'd the force, and blunted the edge of the shrewdest and keenest Argument you have against us poor *Protestants*. But this you say you have more to say to in your *fifth* Reason.

Your *third* Reason is, that *Protestants* are a *Cadmean* brood, that sprang out of the earth arm'd, and gave trouble to their Sovereign Lords in most Countries where they came: And here you travel over the *Mapp*, but say nothing to the purpose. Do you mean by a *Cadmean* brood, people of a *Jesuited* principle? You know the *Motto* of that Society, *Cavete vobis Principes*. But you say the *English Protestants*, though they say they are not concern'd themselves, yet approve and applaud the *Rebellions* of other Subjects abroad, and that they transform *Traitors* into *Heroes*, and canonize *Regicides*. Let them answer for it that do so, if any such there be; and if there be any such, I must assure you they are not *Protestants* of the Church of *England*: But who do you mean canonizes them? the *Pope* in his *Kalendar*, or *Poor Robin* in his *Almanack*? Or what *Traitors* and *Regicides* do you mean? Such as *James Clement*, *Ravillack*, *Garnet*, *Thomas a Becket*? Or such as *Cromwel*, *Bradshaw*, *Colledg*? For there may

may be made large Lists on both sides. But the plain truth of it is, that such persons as those, who design against, and attempt upon the Person and Authority of their lawful *Sovereigns*; let them pretend to be of what *Profession* they please, they have certainly no true sense of *Religion*; nor is that *Religion* which owns such Persons, to be accounted in any sense *Christian Religion*, that shall justify *Practices* so contrary to the *Principles of Christianity*.

But are they *Protestant Subjects* only that *Sovereigns* ought to have a care of? and have *Catholicks* never learn'd to *Rebel*, and that upon the score of Religion too? What meant then the *Holy League in France*, carried on by the *Gnises*, which was the very pattern and spawn of our traiterous *League and Covenant*, and of the late hellish *Association*? You reckon up a great many *Countries* here, but do not so much as give us the least intimation of any *News* from thence; and therefore till your next *Pacquet* come, you are not to expect any farther answer.

In your fourth you commend the *Authority* of the *Catholick Clergy*, which, you say, consists of the *Pope* and *Bishops*: What's become of the *Cardinals*, *Priests Regular* and *Secular*, and all the *Religious Orders*? You say this *Authority* was established by *Christ*, settled by the *Apostles*, &c. but you produce no *Authority* at all for your so saying: For where do you find that *Christ* or his *Apostles* ever spake or thought of a *Pope*, unless it be in that place where there is mention of one, who in the *House of God* should advance himself above every thing that is called *God*. This doth not establish, or settle him, or give him a right to his *Pontifical Throne* and *Triple Crown*, but only foretels his *Usurpation* over all *Princes* and *Sovereigns*, who in Scripture-style are called *Gods*. Well! but if the *Authority* of the *Pope* and his *Bishops* were established by
Christ,

Christ, and settled by the *Apostles*; why may not the like be said of our *English Bishops* too? Since (if a *Pope* be the business) our *Arch-Bishop* has been styled formerly, *Alterius Orbis Papa*. No, that must not be; for we want, you say, *Canonical Ordination*. This, I warrant you, is the story of the *Naggs-Head Tavern*, which has been so fully answered and baffled by *Bishop Bramhal* and others, that I wonder people are not ashamed to serve up such cold *Cabbage*, as you call it, to the Readers. In the close you seem to encourage our *Dissenters* to think, that they have the same right and advantage against the Church of *England*, as the first *Reformers* had against the Church of *Rome*: The case is not at all alike, but quite different betwixt *Them* and *Us*, from what it was betwixt *Us*, that is, our first *Reformers* and *You*: For the *Reformation* was made by the *Authority* of the *Nation*, by the Advice of *Parliament*, and by the Consent and Authority of the *King*, whom we do and ever shall own to be *Supreme* within these his Kingdoms, in all Causes and over all *Persons*, as well *Ecclesiastical* as *Civil*. Our first *Reformers* therefore had the *Laws* and the *Government* on their side: For it was the *King* himself and his *Peers*, the *Lords Spiritual and Temporal*, with the *Commons* of the *Realm*, that were those *Reformers*. But our *Dissenters* have the *Laws* against them, and must put a force upon the *Government*, should they go about to *Reform*; so that an attempt of *Reformation* on their hand, acting without and against *Authority*, is no better than *Rebellion* and *Treason*. And for this reason it is also, that *Popish Priests* for perverting, or (as the Law calls it) *reconciling* the *Kings* Subjects to the Church of *Rome*, (and so bringing them under a foreign *Jurisdiction*, to the prejudice of the *Kings* *Supremacy*) are made *Traitors* by our *Law*, as you know well enough from others *Examples*.

Your

Your *fifth* Reason is answer'd by what I said last to your *fourth* : For here you say, that in our *Reformation* we threw off *Tradition*, gave new interpretations to *Scripture*, abolish'd several of the *Ceremonies*, repeal'd and chang'd several of the *Ecclesiastical Laws*. And why pray should it not be so ? For how could it have been a *Reformation* else *de facto*, without such a change ? And why might it not be so *de jure*, since it was done with the publick Authority of the whole Nation ? But you'll say, Why may not people at this rate *reform* on still and never have done changing, till they have spoiled all ? Let them in the name of God reform on, say I, if they proceed according to due course of Law, and act with *Authority*; for as to *What*, and *How*, and *How far* things are to be reformed, such as you and I are, must leave it to the wisdom and pleasure of our *Governors*.

Your *sixth* Reason is much of the same stamp, that we may upon the same account, lay aside all *Doctrines*, all *Ceremonies*, all *Canons* of the Church, as we have rejected some. And here you learnedly give us a Bedrole of *Hereticks*, and conclude that our *Reformers* were *Abaddons*, destroyers, and not Builders, and that the *Principles* of *Protestancy* are inconsistent with any settled form of Faith, or Church-Government; and that there is no probability of settlement, unless we renounce our *Schism* and *Heresie*, and the *Antient Catholick and Apostolick Faith and Government* be restored. Mr. *Reviser*, all this while you never consider that our *Reformers* went to work with mature deliberation and advice, and acted and settled things by *Authority*, and that we own our *King*, from whom our Church receiveth her whole *Jurisdiction*, the *Supreme* in matters of *Religion*, as well as of *State*. And this was formerly acknowledged by your selves, though afterwards you did usurp upon the rights of the Crown, and that in *Tem-*

porals too as well as *Spirituals*. I say there was a time, when the *Pope* was more modest in his pretensions: As when *Pope Eleutherius* (long before *Pope Gregory*, that sent his *Missionaries* hither) writ to King *Lucy*, the first Christian King we read of, in answer to a Letter he had received from him. He doth not take upon him, or challenge to himself any *Jurisdiction* at all over the *British* King, though in *Spirituals*, but leaves the whole business of settling the *Church*, and the affairs of *Religion*, to the King and his Council; and tells him (which would be a mighty complement now for any *Pope* to say to any *King*) *Vas estis Dei vicarius in terris vestris: You are Gods-Vicar, or Vicegerent, in your Territories*: Wherefore that foolish pretence that the *Church of England* is dependent upon, and ought to be subject to the *Church of Rome*, as the Mother Church, and that, forsooth, because *Pope Gregory* sent *Augustine*, that insolent Monk, to plant and settle Christian Religion here: That pretence, I say, falls to the ground of it self; for we had *Christianity* here amongst us long before, and that as is supposed (for so *Tradition* and *Church-History* too hath informed us) planted by the *Apostles*, or *Apostolical* men, which were other kind of *Missionaries* than those of *Rome*, and afterwards (as we saw a little before) the *Pope* himself in his rescript, own'd the Supremacy of King *Lucy*; and at last when the equivocal St. *Augustine* came hither, though he were received by the *Saxons*, who had never been Christians before, yet the *British Bishops* would not own his Commission, nor submit to his Authority. And our *Kings* all along, ever since the *Conquest*, have upon occasion struggled against the *Papal Usurpation*, and did endeavour what they could to shake off the Yoke, till at last it was effectually done in *Henry* the Eighth's time, who yet himself continued a *Papist*: And in *Edward* the Sixth's days, the *Superstition*, as well as the *Tyranny* of the *Church of Rome*,

Rome, was abolish'd, and the *Antient Catholick and Apostolical Faith and Government*, as you seem to wish, was restored, and has been from time to time, by several wholesom Laws, which we call *Acts of Parliament*, been established, and may by Gods blessing (I doubt not, notwithstanding all your endeavours to the contrary) if those Laws be duly put in execution, be continued to us, and to our Posterities for many Generations. *Hic Rhodus, hic saltus*. All your *Reasons* are but shams: This is the true reason of our Churches being at any time in danger, that the *Laws* are not duly executed, and that *Papish Priests*, and their Disciples and Imps, the *Fanatick Teachers*, contrary to those Laws, and in affront to Government of *State*, as well as *Church*, do under a pretence of Religion, promote *Faction* by debauching Peoples Consciences, and alienating their affections from the Worship and Government, as by Law established. And as long as this is done, I ask you your self, what security we can have for our *peace*, either against *Schism* in the *Church*, or *Faction* in the *State*. *Sic habes animi mei sententiam*.

And this answers your *seventh Reason* drawn from *Experience*; and truly we have had enough of it. You say that shews us, *That it is much easier to destroy than to settle a Government*. Not if the *Government* keep up to its *Laws*, and keep those Laws in force, which is the thing that our *Experience* hath taught us, wherein our great danger lyes. You say *nothing* hath been wanting to the *establishment of the Prelatical Church* in *England*: Your goodness, Sir! you call it *Prelatical*, that your unwary Reader may think it to be *Papistical*; and yet your quarrel against it is, that it is not so. I grant you, *Nothing* hath been wanting, not *Gods special Providence* and *Grace*; not the *Piety* and *care of our Princes*; not the *Authority* and *Prudence of our Governors*; not the *good will*

and zeal of all *Loyal* and well affected *Subjects*; not the *Life*, and *Learning* of the *Protestant Clergy*; not the *Laws* to be sure; but only, as I told you, the *Execution* of those *Laws* has sometimes been wanting. You call them *the severest Laws imaginable*: You and I are not to prescribe to our *Governors*; what *Laws* they should make for the security of the Government; It is my opinion and hearty sence, and grateful acknowledgment, (I know not how you may stand affected) that *God Almighty* hath blest us *English* People with such an easie *Government*, and so gracious a *Governor*, that no *Laws* can be severe enough to secure the *Constitution* of the one, or the *Person* of the other. However, to make you my Confessor for once, if by *the severest Laws imaginable*, you mean (as I suppose you do) the *sanguinary Laws* against *Jesuites*, and *Priests*; I could wish that abatement of the rigor of them, that they might be executed *Alamode a Sweedland*, that the *Criminals* might only be *detestati*, and so unpriested. As to the *Pecuniary Mults*, especially that of *Twelve-pence a Sunday* upon the common *Dissenters*, it is so far from being a severity, that I believe if it were but put in practice, it would, besides reducing them to their Obedience, and making them better *Subjects*, save them mony at the years end, by forcing them in a gentle way to comply with a cheaper way of worship, than what they are in by leaving the Church: For I am confident, that as *Interest* is a great cause of keeping up our divisions at least, if not of making them; so it costs people more to keep from Church, that is to go to *Conventicles*, than it would do to keep to their own Church; that is, It is more chargeable to serve God in a *wrong* way than in a *right*. You say that our Church appeared first with the plausible colours of an *Apostolical Reformation*: Nay they were true and lasting colours, but you mean *sans doubt* plausible pretences. Alas! *Reformation* is a word you cannot endure, that would spoil

spoil your *Infallibility*, and *Apostolical* perhaps much less: For what would then become of *Pope* and *Cardinals*, of *Mass* and *Purgatory*, and indeed the whole trade and frippery of your Religion? Yet you observe (with grief and pity, do you not?) that our Church for all its advantages of those *plausible colours*, and *Royal favour*, and the *severest Laws imaginable*, ere *one Age had past*, the *peccant humors bred within her laid her in the dust*, and the *Crown* it self with her, which it was hoped she would uphold. Sure enough those who endeavoured the subversion of Church and Crown, did not hope the one would uphold the other: But this I will say to you, and speak it with that assurance as becomes a Loyal and Dutiful Subject. Let the *Crown* uphold the *Church* of England as it is now by Law established, and the *Church* will not only, as in duty bound upon a *moral* account, out of a dutiful and affectionate sense, but also even by *natural* consequence, uphold the *Crown* of England; it being impossible that any true Son of that Church, should ever turn *Rebel* or *Traitor*. Those *peccant humors* in the Church I have already told you what they are, the insinuations of *Popish Priests* and *Fanatick Teachers*; which unless the Laws be executed to suppress them, will always be in agitation and give disturbance. The *spring of those Mischiefs*, you say is not to be sought any where *abroad*: No, we are sensible enough, experience hath taught us we need not seek it; it cometh to us by mission, from Father Garnet downward. You say those mischiefs *rise from the Reformation* it self, and are *inseparable from the Protestant Church*. Right! The envy and malice of the *Romish Party* against the *Reformation*, and an *establish'd Church*, which is the great bulwark against *Popery*, will always keep that party at work for its destruction; and that ground which they have gotten of it in our divisions, amongst the *Seſtaries*, hath given them great advantage for the effecting of it: So that in effect,

effect, the sum of your *Reasons* is this. The *Protestant Church*, and in particular the *English Protestant Church*, shall never be free from *Faction* and *Schism*, if you can help it; I mean if *Popish Priests* and *Sectaries* may have their will; and consequently shall always be in continual danger, and as you hope (for that is the drift of your *Argumentation*) shall one time or other, very suddenly come to an end. For as you very well observe to our hands, pag. 120. *The discourse of Religion is the most common in England, and will be so, till men talk themselves either out of all Religion, or into a good one, either into Atheism* (that is, as you mean, *out of all Religion*) *or into Popery*, (that is, I suppose you mean, *into a good one*.) And how good a one that is, or is likely to be, you tell us in another place in your *Latin*, p. III. where you wish that our *Protestant Ministers* had not rent the Church with so many *Schisms*, &c. to the grief of good men, and the sport of the bad, and the Triumph of Devils, to see a way laid open, by their means, to *Libertinism* and *Atheism*; where *Libertinism* is opposed to *Atheism*, as *Popery* and *Atheism* are opposed here.

Your eighth and last Reason is taken from the *Protestant Clergy* it self, which it seems wants some of your *modelling* and *principling*, to prevent *Schism* in the Church, and *Faction* in the State. Poor men! what shall we do with them? Shall we send over yearly a parcel of them to *St. Omars* and *Doway*, to be instructed there how to cajole people to the *Worship of God, and Duty to their King*? We have too many such abroad already, and that has been the occasion of those severe *Laws* you complain of, that together with your Foreign Institution, you imbibe a *Vatinian* hatred against the *English Church*, and your *Native Countrey*, to which all the sacred ties of *Nature* and *Religion* (one would think) should oblige your affections and

and duties. But what is it in the *Protestant Clergy*, that you find fault with, either in Life or Learning? *Nam video quid despicere possit Antonius.* To pass by the lives of your Popes, as *Platina* has written them with a witness, your *Jesuites* Morals, and the Lives of your *Religions* in all Orders, have been notorious, and are taken notice of by several of your own Authors: Not to tell you that in the *Augmentation Office*, at the dissolution of the *Abbeys*, *Priories*, and *Nunneries* here in *England*, you will find large and open confessions in this kind, under the hands of the *Monks* and *Friars* themselves, in several places. But is it that you are civil, or is it the greatness of your Spirit, that having to do with a Bishop, you scorn to meddle with the inferior *Clergy*? You appeal to experience, and reserve your Reasons *in petto*, till some farther occasion be given. Very good Sir, take your own time.

I have bestowed all this pains upon this one passage, because though it be indeed an impertinence, yet being set in the Front of your *Preface*, and seeming by way of general defiance, to decide the whole controversie at one blow; and you laying such a stress upon it, as to back it with *Eight Reasons*; I did not think it convenient slightly to pass it by, or give you the opportunity of going out of the Field with such a *bravado*, without an answer. I had a thought once to have brought hither another passage, much of the same nature, in p. 25. where you pretend to prove that *Protestants cannot be saved*; so that you are for destroying us in in both Worlds. But that we will leave to its own proper place, as having given the *Reader* trouble enough already. Now to the business in hand.

And here, as becometh a man of business to do, you treat my Lord of *WINTON*, *sans ceremony*. He must be

be called hereafter *D. M.* what's that? the Duke of *Monmouth*? For so those two Letters do usually signifie in our English Prints. Oh! 'Tis Dr. *Morley*: Well, you are a civil Gentleman however, that you will allow him any Title at all; and when he was abroad in Exile, and when he writ some of those *Treatises*, he was indeed plain Dr. *Morley*. But my Lord of *Winton* would have been a fitter style for a *Bishop*, and a *Peer of the Realm*, as you, at first setting out, owned him to be. That *respect*, it should seem, was but a copy of your countenance, and you knew better things than so, at the very time of writing that: For you tell us p. 37. of your *Revision*, that he is but a pretended *Right Reverend Bishop*, and p. 65: a pretended *Bishop*; and so by your consequence, I suppose, hath forfeited his *Peerage* too, that now henceforward the most civil term you can afford him is Mr. *Doctor*, as you call him in several places. But he is never a whit the worse man, call you him what you will; nor the less a *Bishop*, or a *Peer of the Realm*, for all your calling him a pretended *Bishop*; nor yet is his Book e're a whit the more answered, for your pretending to have made an Answer to it.

You are concern'd that he calls *Mainbourg* a *Jesuit*, when he had been dismissed the *Society*, and was got among the *Secular Priests*: And this the *Bishop* might, you say, have informed himself out of *Mainbourg's* own Book, and the publick *Gazettes*, if his Lordship had been at leisure to read them, or had thought it worth his while to have made the Inquiry. Your concern for the *Jesuits* is not for nothing; I perceive once and again, that you have a particular Veneration for that *Holy Order*: But what's the hurt, whether *Mainbourg* be a *Jesuit*, or be a *Secular Priest*? He was a *Jesuit* when he writ that Book: Ay, but his *Superiors*, you say, would not let him print it whilst he was a *Jesuit*. That matters not, it was *Mainbourg*

bourg the Jesuit was the Author of that Book, tho' he had not that favour, as you had, to Print it *Permissu Superiorum*. But why are the Fathers so shy in licencing? For I see they do permit Books as silly as his could be, and of as bad principles and tendencies: Why? It was, belike, because of that passage in it concerning her R. H. for so you say his *Superiors* did not permit it, *knowing how sacred the secrets of Princes ought to be*. Happy Fathers, that are intrusted with the secrets of Princes! This is that which makes that *Order* glorious, and gives them advantage for setting up the *Papal Monarchy*. And Happy Princes, that have the *Holy Fathers* for your Ministers of State, and keepers of your secrets! But what do I? The truth of it is, now I see you are only *captious*, now you confess the thing: For by reason his *Superiors* never permitted him to print, you say that that *Paper* of his *crept about only in written copies*. That *Paper* it seems was Mainbourg's the Jesuit's, and it *crept about* whilst he was a Jesuit: But you say it was *seen by few*: like enough; for why should any be at the trouble of transcribing it? And *of these* you say, (that is, those few that saw it) *not many believed it*. Right! How could there be *many* among a *few*? and when there were but *few* that saw it, how can we properly say that *many*, or not many of *those few* believed it, or believed it not? And now you say that D. M. hath spread it: but I say Mainbourg himself spread it; for he gave about *written copies* of it whilst he was a Jesuit, and after he turn'd *Secular Priest*, you say he put it in *Print*; and so you say by that means he (that is D. M.) has *prejudiced his Mother the Church of England*. Good natur'd man! you have that pity for our poor Mother, that I dare say if D. M. or any one else had done so, you would not only have pardoned him, but have commended him for it. What influence Her R. H.'s Example may have, it doth not concern me to inquire; and what the Bishop's Judgment is, he himself has sufficiently made known.

Though the *Fathers* were nice in giving way to the Printing of *Mainbourg's* Book, because of that passage in it about the late *Dutchess of York*, out of a sacred regard to the secrets of *Princes*; yet I see you are not at all nice, but confident enough, in asserting and avowing the truth of that passage, as to matter of *Fact*, though it depend only upon the Word and Credit of *Mainbourg*, one whom the very *Jesuits* themselves thought fit to dismiss out of their Society; so little it seems his *Credit* and *Interest* was amongst his own *Companions*. And why then ought any *Reader* to credit him in a thing of such concern?

You say, *The Bishop relates many things in his Preface to little purpose*. If it were so, you ought not of all men to take notice of it; but certainly he did think they were to purpose, to his purpose at least, to shew the world what he had been doing, how he liv'd and convers'd, all the time of his *Exile*, and how he had kept himself free from complying with any of the *Popish Idolatries and Superstitions*, on the one hand, when he lived among the *Papists*; or with any *Novel usages and practices*, contrary to those of our own and the *Primitive Church*, on the other hand, whilst he lived among the *Presbyterians*; as himself gives the account p. 12. of his *Preface*. And if a *History* were to be furnished out of those *Instances and Circumstances* (which he there mentions) for the writing of his *Life*, (as you scoffingly say;) I should make no question but it would shew as well as any of your *Legendary Saints*; nor would the *Reader* meet with so many *venerable Rattles and Hobby-horses* (as you call them) there, as you dress those *Religious Farces* with.

As to what you quote from the *Bishop*, out of p. 8. of his *Preface*, where he gives *Monfieur Bouchart* some Reasons, why he forbore to come to the *Protestant Church*
at

at Caen in Normandy; one of which was, because if they did not favour and encourage, yet they did not, at least they had not hitherto, condemned or reprov'd the scandalous, and rebellious proceedings of their Presbyterian Brethren in England, against the King and the Church; which till they should do, says the Bishop, by some publick Act or manifestation of their Judgment to the contrary, he could not chuse but think they approved, or at least did not dislike. Does this imply only, as you say, their being idle Spectators of that Tragedy? Or does it deny that they might be Actors in it, as you say many think they were? For I do believe, and I think I have heard as much credibly said, that there were Jews, Papists, and men of all Religions, and almost of all Nations, in the Parliament Rebel Army. Though I do also believe and know, that many worthy Loyal Families and Persons, if not most of the Popish Perswasion, were in Arms all along for the King: So that the proof you bring from those many English Women, in Geneva, who followed their Husbands thither at the end of the Wars, is needless; and I have that good opinion of you, that if those Women had told it you by way of confession, you would not have spoken of it. What you bring out of Grotius against the Doctrine of Subjects taking up Arms against their Kings for Religion, the Bishop is no way concern'd in; nor what opinion Duplessis, Beza, or Peter du Monlin, were of in the Case. You see the Bishop's reasons of his forbearance to joyn in Communion with the French Protestants, had that success, that that Learned Protestant Monsieur Bouchart, (in his Answer to the Bishop) condemns the taking up of Arms by Subjects, against their Sovereigns, in defence of Religion, or for any other cause, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.

Mr. Revisor, You tell us that you designed once to draw the matters handled in the Bishops Treatises, into some method,

rhod, which would help to their understanding. That would have been a favour, but the truth on't is, neither the *Treatises*, nor the *Reader*, I think, need it: For the *Bishop's* discourse is so rational, and so expressive, that it is obvious to every understanding. But the reason why you did not pursue that design seems wonderful, *because*, say you, *that would have made my Answer less satisfactory.* For it is strange, that that which would help a mans understanding, should make him less satisfied. Well! But you did well to take the *easier way*, to follow your *Author as he leads you.* Hold there! you are not so easie to be led; *step by step*, say you? Nay I will assure you, you jump and leap as you see good in several places, as I have already given you an instance in this *Preface*, and may give you many more.

You say you have *omitted nothing material*, and yet immediately, as if you designed knowingly to contradict your self, you say that you *omit in your Revision, the Letters of the Regular Priest*; which I take (with submission to better Judgment) to be as *material* things as any in the whole Book. The reason you give why you do omit them, was, *because they do not ground the Judgment of D. M. in Matters of Religion.* No sure, his Judgment was grounded long before; but what then? The same Judgment may by another mans Sense and Writings be confirm'd: For what do you think was the reason why the *Bishop* published those *Letters*, but to shew he did in his Judgment approve them? You will say, What had I to do with a pitiful *Priest*? My business lyes solely with the *Bishop*: True, but you have not acquitted your self to the *Bishop*, by not answering those *Letters*, which though written by a *Regular Priest*, yet were designed in defence and vindication of the *Church of England*; and the *Bishop*, by his publication and approbation of them, made them his own. Come! I'll tell you the true reason why you
did

did not answer those *Letters* : It was because you *could not* ; though truly at that shuffling rate as you use to answer, I do not see why a man of your Parts and confidence, might not have ventur'd upon the undertaking.

As for the *Bishop's* Letter to Mr. Trigland, you leave that out, *as containing nothing to your purpose* : Truly had you consulted that reason, you would have left out a great deal more ; I mean a great deal of what you have done, which is little or nothing to any bodies purpose. You say *one point* there treated is, *His Majesties being a Protestant* ; this is *nothing*, it seems, *to your purpose* ; but it was highly to His Majesty's purpose, and to the whole Nations purpose. The other is, the assistance of the States for His Majesties Restoration : This was to the like purpose at that time, when we had no hope, no expectation of His being restored, as he was, without Arms. You say this is a business of *Policy*, and you never commenc'd *Batchelor* in that Faculty ; Ay, but on my word, when you have a mind to it, when the humour takes you, you are an absolute Doctor in it ; and indeed you are a man at every thing, nothing comes amiss to you.

Well ! For all this quarrel and controversie, I see we shall have peace at last, and agree well enough : For I suppose your *Preface* was the last thing you writ of your Book, and here towards the latter end of your *Preface*, I meet with this hopeful expression : *I hope, say you, at least it long hath been, is, and shall be my constant Prayer ; and is and shall be mine, say I ; and is and will be every good Christians Prayer I hope, That the God of Peace put an end to those contentious disputes in the Church.* In the Name of God, Sir, who bid you begin them ? For the *Bishop* gave you no provocation, nor did he design any thing of Controversie ; but only Printed what he thought was necessary for his own Vindication, from the slander
of

of *Elymas the Sorcerer*, upon the intimation of *Mainbourg the Jesuit*. You hope, you say, *that we may all come to compose but one Sheepfold* (in the *Roman-Catholick Church*, or in the *whole Catholick Church*, do you mean?) *under one Shepherd*, (the *Pope* you mean I suppose) but, *under Christ* and his Vicegerent, I joyn with you.

If you had left out *Father Cressy's* concern, as you thought once to have done, you had saved your Reader some *patience*, and your self some *trouble* in Writing, and *charge* in Printing, and I think have lost no honour in the omission. It is pity that *second thoughts* should not always prove the wiser, but your *Zeal* to his holy Order, more than your *Friendship* to his Person, I suppose, must be your excuse: Though that which you call *too severe a charge on him*, will be found to be a just one, and those *Reflections upon his whole holy Order*, are for such practices as are common and usual with all your holy Orders.

You say, that for the *Readers* ease, you have set down the *Dr.'s own words*, *commonly at large*, at least *their full sence*: How you do that we have a notable *Specimen* at the very first dash, where you charge him with *Calvinism*, but prove it neither by his *own words at large*, much less *in their full sence*. You wipe your mouth however, and with great demureness say, that *Truth* is pretended to on both sides, *but only one side* (that's your side sure) *contends for it sincerely*, the other (that's the *Bishop's* side no doubt) *opposes it with all his power*. But yet see how brimfull of thoughts of Peace you are! *God grant to all*, you say, *a sincere love of Peace and Church-union*; and then *all these disputes will cease*. This is a wish, that all Religions will joyn with you in: For the meaning on't is, as you say it, Let us all be *Papists*; as the *Turk* would say it, Let us all be *Mahumetans*; and so in any Religion whatsoever,

ever, let us all turn and be of that *Religion*, and then all is well, the World will be at quiet. But the question is, wherein every pious conscientious Person would be satisfied; *Which is the True Religion of them all? Which is that Religion among them all, wherein I may truly serve God, and assuredly save my own Soul at the last? That Religion*, will the pious Person say, which bids fairest to these purposes, shall be mine; and that, wherein by the Grace of God, I will live and dye. Now whether the Religion professed in the Church of *Rome*, or that professed in the Church of *England*, be the right Religion; hath been the Controversie, which hath exercised several Writers on both sides, ever since the Reformation; and God knows whether ever it will be determin'd whilst the world lasteth. Nevertheless I take it to be the duty of every good *Christian*, as to satisfy his own Conscience in particular in his choice and practice of Religion, so to wish and pray for *Peace* in general, and to endeavour it by all amicable applications and friendly Offices to all men, of whatever persuasion, according to the great and fundamental Rule of Religion; *To do by others, as we would our selves be done by*. But stay! finding you in a good humor of *Praying*, I am got to *Preaching*. One word more to your *Preface*, and I have done.

In your *Postscript* you seem to pretend to *Prophecy* or *Astrology*, in fore-telling the *Rye-Plot*: How was that? Why you say that those words in the *III. p.* That *Factionous Men are Proficients in the Art of promoting Mischief*, were written in *March* last, (83.)

Upon that you say, that *You little dreamed to see your conjecture confirmed so soon, in such a notorious manner as it was by the Rye-Plot, and Blunderbusses*. Why Sir, Did you know any thing of the *Rye-Plot*, when you wrote those words? If you did, why did not you discover it
to

to some *Justice of Peace*, or *Privy-Counsellor*? If you did not, why did you mention it at all? For it is no more than if a man should say, *There are naughty People in the world*; there will continually be Treasons set on foot, and Villanies practised in the world; and nothing but the Gallows will stop such wicked people: And then, when any of them comes to be discovered, and punished for such things, should cry, *Look you now! did not I say so, that Faction Men are Proficients in the Art of promoting mischief*? And I beseech God to grant, that all such Plots and Contrivances of Mischief, whether by *Papists* or *Sectaries*, by all those that wish ill to the *Crown* or *Church*, may ever be disappointed; That our *King*, and *Government*, both in *Church* and *State*, as by Law establish'd, may ever be preserved from such Traiterous Attempts and Practices; and that, as you word it, *the root of all these Traiterous Practices (the hatred of innocent Men and Loyal Subjects, if that be the root, or whatever else be so) may cease*, and be utterly extirpated out of the Nation: By *Innocent Men, and Loyal Subjects*, meaning all those that conform to the Government, whether in *Church* or *State*, as by Law now establish'd; for else you know that *Sectaries* as well as *Papists*, when they are found out and discovered in these Traiterous Practices, are apt enough (if we will take their own words) to avow their own *Innocence* and *Loyalty*, how ever faulty they may be.

And thus, Sir, I take leave of your *Preface*: In the rest of your *Review*, I shall not be so curious or unthrifty of my time, as to catch at every shadow that offers it self, but only insist on those things, (if any there are) that are somewhat material and *a propos*, to the matter in hand, *viz.* What may more nearly concern the business of *Religion*, and the *Bishop's Judgment* therein: For really as to *impertinence* and needless *digressions*, *Cavils*, and
 sorry

sorry *Evasions*; it is but time mispent, and the wasting of Paper, and tying the Readers patience: And for *raillery* and reproachful Language, from which one would have thought *D. M.* his venerable *Age*, being now 86. his *dignity* in the Church, being a *Bishop*, his honourable Quality, being a *Peer of the Realm*, might have secured him. I shall not henceforward meddle with that, but commend to you the reading of that Answer, which the Reverend, Learned, and truly Pious Dr. *Hammond* gave to a Brother of yours (I suppose your Friend *Anti-Haman*) concerning *Calumny* and *Slander*, in a Book of his for the Vindication of the Church of *England* from *Schism*.

H

THE

very English; it is but time spent, and the waiting of
 papers, and trying the Readers patience: And for saying
 and repeating a language, from which one would have
 thought it his vernacular, being now & then
 way in the Church, being a word, his honorable Opin-
 ion, being a word of the Bishop, might have found him
 I shall not heretofore make words with that, but comment
 on your reading of that Answer, which the Reverend
 I found, and now I find Dr. Johnson gave to a friend
 of yours, I repeat, one I find (that I have) con-
 sidering Calvary and Shew, in a book of his for the Visi-
 tion of the Church of England from 1717.

T. H.

H.

THE CONFERENCE betwixt Father
DARCY and Dr. MORLEY, at
BRUXELS, 1649.

HAVING thus, Mr. *Revisor*, attended you step by step, throughout your general *Preface*, and by giving particular Answers to every thing which might deserve or not deserve an Answer, shewn the possibility of making the like Returns, to every thing you say in your *Revision* of the several *Treatises*; I do presume it will not be expected, by you or the Reader, that I should bestow the like pains all over, especially since I dare make my Appeal to him and your self both, that I have made full and sufficient Reply to those two *Topicks*, which you seem to have intended your Master-pieces and Arguments of Triumph, by placing them purposely in the Front, to wit, your Charge of *Calvinism* upon the Bishop, and the impossibility of preventing *Schism* in the Church, and *Faction* in the State, according to the *English Protestant* Constitution. And indeed I did in that Essay think my self obliged, as to discuss every particular, so to suit my Expressions somewhat to that Character of Style, which is very familiar to you in all parts of your Book: But henceforward I shall not think my self obliged to do the one or the other, and only make what speed I can to accompany you in your several Stages, without either noise or dust.

First then, as to the *Conference* between Father Darcy and Dr. Morley at *Bruxels*, which the Dr. himself owns was but *short*, and says that he gives us but the *summ* of it neither; you seem to make it a questionable thing, whether there were such a *Conference* at all or no; whereas you know, that an ordinary *Priest* has had the priviledge heretofore to be believed upon his *Word*, and a *Peer* of the Realm, as you have acknowledged the *Bishop* to be, hath still the same Priviledge in any Court, to be believ'd upon his *Honour*: Besides that, this Narrative of the Bishops is attested by another Right Honourable Personage, the Lord Viscount *Newburg*. At least you say you believe, that Father Darcy hath not been fairly represented, as a Man of his Giant-like *Abilities in Controversie*, ought to have been; wherefore no doubt you will supply what has been wanting in the management of that Discourse, to the doing of him Right.

The chief Argument against *Infallibility*, you say, to prove that your Church *can err*, is because it *hath erred*; and it is such an Argument, as be it in what hand it will, my Lord *Faulkland's*, or whosoever else, will be irrefragably true, and unanswerable to the end of the World. For not to mention the *Communion of Infants*, which is but one single instance, place the *Infallibility* where you please, either in the *Pope's Chair*, or in a *General Council*, or in both, seeing that Pope hath thwarted Pope, and one General Council hath contradicted another, in their Decrees and Determinations, it must inevitably follow, that there must have been an Error on the one side or the other, since both parts of a Contradiction cannot be true.

Further, to give you one other Argument *Ex abundanti*, I will not say it is not *probable*, as your way of arguing is, but it is not possible, that that Church can be *Infallible* in its Judgment, which cannot have a certainty
of

of its own being a Church; but where there is no certainty of the *Sacraments*, there can be no certainty of a Church; and there can be no certainty of the *Sacraments*, where the Virtue ~~of~~ the Efficacy of their Administration depends upon the *Intention* of the *Priest* who administers them, it being impossible for any one Man, to know what anothers Intention is, in any Action, be it never so serious, since it is a priviledg belonging to God alone to know the Hearts of Men.

From Father *Darcy's* courteous Reception and his giving an Account of his Colledg, you take an occasion to enlarge your self upon the Civility and Charity of the *English Jesuits* to their Countrymen, as their procuring *Bedlow's* liberty at *Valladolid*, their saving *Dangerfield* from the Gallows in the Low-Countries, and their Relieving *Otes*, and that in *England*, *Spain* and *Flanders*, as long as there was any hopes of his Amendment, that is, I suppose, as long as he was true to you, and serviceable to your Designs. And yet you complain, as you have perhaps reason to do, that this *Jesuitical Kindness* very often meets with a *True Protestant Gratitude*, that is, it does not take its effect, nor answer the Fathers ends, to the great disappointment of their hope. That I confess is a rare Example of Charity in the *Jesuit*, who was content to thrust his Neck into a Halter, as you say, to excuse the *Benedictine* from it, by a mistaken Indictment; but would not this have been to have died in the Defence of a Lie, as well as of his Neighbour, and so designed in favour of the Doctrin of *Equivocation*.

What you say of their *Novitiate*, of their *Exercises*, of their *Poverty*, &c. is not at all to our purpose; though I question not your Informations, as supposing, that it is not for nothing that you have that Zeal and Esteem for that *Society*, of which it is not usual for Men of any other Order to speak with that kindness as you do. From what
the

the Bishop saies upon his having heard an account of the manner of their *Living, Lodging, Diet, &c.* that they are *things all of them in their several kinds, for the substance of them very commendable, and worthy the Imitation*; and yet his holding the *Mafs*, which is the chief Action of the *Jesuits*, you say to be downright Idolatry, that he does, as you say, condemn the same thing in *Retail*, which he approves in *Gross*, you make it a *Contradiction*, and leave him *this Bone to pick*. It is a *Bone* that may be easily picked, and being no *Contradiction* needs no *Reconcilement*; for there was no mention, either explicate or implicate made of the *Mafs*, among those things which he owns to be thus commendable, unless you will say, that it is included in the *Spiritual Hours and Exercises*, which Words I am confident, they do not use to that purpose, to mean the being at *Mafs*; and it lies on your part to prove that they do; besides, that you do not take notice of that Restriction that is laid upon this Commendation, that they are things *in their several kinds, for the substance of them*, very commendable; though he did not, could not approve of them in their *Circumstances* and *Manners of Performance*; As to give you a like Instance, Should a *Papist* or a *Protestant* be at *Constantinople*, and either himself observe, or be told by others, that the *Turks* are a People Civil in their Conversation, Just in their Dealings, Devout in their Prayers, and Constant in their attendance at their *Mosques*, which are the Places of their Rublick Worship, and then should say, that *these things, even in the Mahometans, are all of them, in their several kinds, for the substance of them, very commendable, and worthy the Imitation* of Christians; must he therefore be thought to approve their *Alcoran*, because he approves their *Manners* and good *Orders*? So that by commending what is commendable on either hand, we do not Justifie the one or the other Religion, nor must be thought to approve the *Alcoran* on the one hand, or the *Mafs*

Mass on the other ; so that in short, here is no *Contradiction* in commending what was to be commended, and in not approving what was not to be approved ; in that, though it relate to the *same persons*, yet it is not the *same thing*, which is commended and which is disapproved.

My Lord *Andover's* Proposal for a free and charitable Debate betwixt some Learned and Moderate Men of both Churches towards finding some Expedient to compose their Differences, will not go down with you, he being, you doubt, no competent Judge in the Case : and here you declare at large how unsuccessful Conferences are for the composition of Differences in Religion, and set down your Reasons why they are so ; upon which you tell us, that the Civil and Canon Law have forbid all Disputations ; and yet, to Justifie your own Undertaking I suppose, you say, that Divines do hold them, in some Cases not unlawful, which is your way of *Shuffling*, after you have denied a thing, to grant it ; and yet still, you will not accept those two Conditions hinted by that Honorable Person, that the Disputants be Learned and Moderate, and that they proceed freely and charitably, but conclude, the only means to put a good end to all Disputes in Religion is to procure a sincere Love of Peace and mutual Communion ; and what fairer, what likelier way can there be to do that, than what his Lordship proposed, to have the things in question freely and charitably debated by some Learned and Moderate Men ? It is true, yours is a certain way to do the business, if all Men could or would be of one Mind ; but when or how is this likely to be effected ? You go on to say, that the Protestants are the greatest of Hereticks ; which has been answered before. You tell us, that all Spiritual and Temporal Jurisdiction is derived from the same fountain, and that the Prelate and the Prince own their Authority on the same Tenure ; so that what strikes at one, wounds the other ; which granting it to be true, yet with submission,

I cannot but think that a *sawcy* Inference wherein you caution the *Prince* against the danger of his countenancing a Liberty against the *Prelate* with this home-spun Proverb, *What is Sawce for a Goose is Sawce for a Gander*; not to tell you, that that Doctrin of deriving all Power, not from God, but from the People, where the main danger lies, hath been borrowed by Our *Presbyterians* and other *Settaries* from some of your *Schoolmen*.

You ask the *Bishop*, whether he *blushed* or *smiled*, to say and to print, as he does, *at this time of Day*? that it was unsafe for him *then* to enter into a Dispute of Religion at *Bruxells*, though he had known *Priests* of the *Romish Party* had with all boldness, freedom and safety, maintained such Disputes in *England*: but is it not true what the *Bishop* saies, that your *Priests*, as I my self could name several, have had, at several times, the freedom of such Disputes; and let me ask you, could it have been prudent and safe for D. Morley to have done that at *Bruxells* then, which you do now in *England*? and why do you say, *At this time of Day*, when you your self write with such boldness, freedom and safety against one of the Oldest and Greatest of our *English Bishops*? Which if D. Morley had done at *Bruxels* against any of your *Bishops*, do you think he should have escaped the danger of an *Inquisition*, or some other *Censure*, perhaps as severe? But you turn the Tables, and complain of those Cruelties, which are exercised upon *Priests* guilty of no Crime, unless *Priesthood* be one. You say right, that *Priesthood*, I mean your *Priesthood* which owns a *Foreign Jurisdiction* and *Supremacy*, is by our Laws made a Crime, if you come over into *England* to exercise that Priesthood here, as I have given you an Account in the *Preface*; and here, you would work us into some compassion, by seeming to bemoan the Church of *England*, in that the Chief Actors in the late Tragedy were as little Friends to her *Hierarchy* as to that of *Rome*;

so notable a dexterity you of that Party have, as occasion shall serve, either to herd among the *Seſſaries* in a joynt Opposition to the Church of *England*; or to shelter your selves under a pretence that the Church of *England* and you are in the like Danger from the *Seſſaries*.

D. *Morley* said, there could be but little fruit of a *Conference*, when one of the Parties were resolved before-hand to hold their Conclusion, and to remit nothing; which you say is very *uncharitable* and *untrue* to boot. You tell us a Story of the Pope's Offer to *Q. Elizabeth*, but without any Authority; and that the true and only Reason that hinders our Peace, is, that the *Schismatical*, that is, the *Protestant* Party is resolved never to rest satisfied with what is remitted. *When, where and by whom* was this Proffer made, or how ever put upon Trial? Not at the Council of *Trent* to be sure; for indeed, the *remitting* of any thing, would look too like the confessing of an *Error*, and by consequence call in Question your Churches *Infallibility*; which is so tender a Point, that *F. Darcy* looks upon it as the *most important* of all others in Matters of *Faith*; and well he might; for it is that which being once believed will give the Man a large *Swallow*, and make easie way for all the rest; so that, though the Church *may*, if She will, in Things of *Ecclesiastical Constitution*, in order to Christian Peace, alter sometimes; yet since that *most important* Point of *Infallibility* is somewhat concerned even in things of that Alloy, She *will* in all likelyhood be very shy of making Allowances. You say, if *all Christians in all Places*, which with you is the *Church Diffusive*, that is, as you named it before, the *Whole Catholick Church*, did not or cannot err; then the *first Protestants* did err. By what Consequence this? because, you'll say they divided from *all other Christians*: but we have proved before, that they are Parts of the *Whole Catholick Church* as well as *other Christians*, of what soever Denomination, and divided no more than those o-

I

ther

ther Christians did; and consequently do belong to that Church Diffusive, viz. the Whole Catholick Church, which cannot err, though the Roman-Catholick Church can err, and hath erred.

For the proving of which, the *Communion of Infants* was instanced in; which the Church of Rome once held for *Matter of Faith* to be necessary to Salvation, which now it doth not hold to be so. And it was made good out of Maldonate the Jesuit, one of your own Authors, that it had been not only the Opinion of St. Innocent and St. Austin, but was *Dogma de Fide Universalis Ecclesie*; a Tenet or Doctrine of Faith, held by the Universal Church for six hundred years: To which you answer, that what Maldonate says, makes nothing against the Churches Infallibility, in defining things of Faith; for he neither says nor could say with truth, say you, that She ever defined any thing in this matter. But what is this but to shift when you should answer? For what can be meant here by *Dogma de Fide Universalis Ecclesie*, but a Definition and Determination, an Opinion and Doctrine, as well as a Practice and Usage of the Universal Church? So that all that ramble of yours, in distinguishing of Participation Sacramental or Spiritual, and in Voto, and the great difference betwixt what is directly treated, and what only accidentally mentioned in Decrees of Faith, is but the more plausibly to tell us, that what Maldonate says, and what your self said before, is untrue. For at your entrance into this Discourse, you do acknowledge that the Communion was given to Infants, out of an opinion that it was necessary to Salvation, grounded on those Words of Christ, Joh. 6. and withal you give an account of the manner how it was given, that when Infants were baptized, because the Sacrament (you mean the Communion) could not without danger be administered to them under the species of Bread alone, it was given under the other species,

species; the Priest dipping his Finger, say you, into the Holy Chalice, gave it them to suck; or a little particle of the *species* of Bread soaked in the consecrated Wine, was laid on their Tongue. These are your own words: It seems then, that in those Times by the allowance of the Church, very *Infants* received it in *both kinds*; and this certainly was a *Real and Sacramental Participation*. And how then can you say, and say it with truth, that it was only a *Mystical or Spiritual Participation*, which, you say, both *You* and *We* believe is attained by the Sacrament of *Baptism*? Or that it was a *Participation in Voto*, in Desire, which all have and are bound to have, you say, when they are Baptized. Again, with what *Grammatical Construction* can you interpret *Infant-Communion*, which *Maldonate* says, is *Dogma de Fide Universalis Ecclesie*, to be a thing only *accidentally mentioned*, and not to be *directly defined*, as a Decree of Faith or Doctrine of the Church? So that, instead of breaking the *Weapon*, which you say hath been broken in Viscount *Faulkland's* Hand, you have only broken your own, and endeavour'd to break your Fellow's Head; such excellent skill you have at *Cudgel-playing*.

In the last place, *That none can be saved out of the True Church of Christ*. You might have spared your Proofs; We grant it; but that the *Protestants* are out of the True Church, and therefore *Schismaticks*, you will never be able to prove: For I have shewn before, upon your own Concessions, that though we are not of the *Roman-Catholick* Church, yet we are of the *Whole Catholick* Church, as you allow all other *Christians*, that is, all that are not of the *Roman* Communion, of *what denomination soever*, to be: And why you should exclude *Protestants* alone from that Priviledg, which you allow there to *all other Christians*, you shew no Reason, but only that *Luther* was

a Schismatick, and consequently all his Followers must be so: And why was *Luther* a Schismatick? Because, you say, he separated from *all Christians living*. How then came it about, that so many thousands of *Christians* joyn'd with him, if he separated from them *all*? But this Argument against *Luther*, were it of any force, doth not reach our *English Protestants*, because We had nothing to do with *Luther* or *Calvin*, but Reform'd upon another account, by a Publick and Just-Authority of our own; as I suppose those Countries, which admitted of *Luther's* Reformation or *Calvin's*, will likewise tell you, they did also. And whereas you say in another place, that the Sentiments of *Protestants* in Matters of Faith, are as contrary to those of *all Christians in all places*, as to those of the *Roman Church*, except that One Point of *Papal Power*; you speak much at Random: For We do not only agree with them in that One Point, against the *Pope's* pretended Supremacy, but We agree with *them* also and with *you* too, in all Points necessary to Salvation, in all the Fundamentals of *Christian Religion*, viz. in all the Articles of the *Creed*, which is the Standard of Faith; in all the Commandments of the *Decalogue*, which is the Rule of Practice, not so much as leaving out one of them, as *you* and the *Lutherans* do, and in all those decent and convenient usages and Ceremonies of *Worship*, which either *Scripture* or *Primitive Practice* hath recommended to us; and so far as this comes to, We are willing, for our part, to own a Communion with *you*, and with *all Christians* whatever. But those Corruptions of *Doctrine* which you maintain, and those Superstitions of *Worship* which you impose, have made it unlawful for *Protestants*, and other *Christians* also, to hold Communion with *you*; nor, were the Conditions of your Communion lawful, are We of the Church of *England* under any obligation, but that of *Christian Charity*, to hold Communion with *you*; much less by way of

Subordination, as being of a Church that hath distinct Powers and Rights of its own, and needs not submit her self to any *Foreign Jurisdiction*, and as the Law hath established her, ought not to do it neither. Wherefore your *Excommunication*, as to Us, is *Brutum Fulmen*, and it concerns us no more to hear you call us *Schismatics*, than it does to hear *Turks* call Christians *Dogs*; for there can be no *Schism* where there is no obligation to *Communion*; nay, where there are so many Obligations against it. But the case of our *Schismatics* amongst our selves is otherwise, as being under a necessary Obligation, by having a just Authority and a legal *Jurisdiction* over them, established by the *Laws* of the *Land* and the *Church*, whereof they are *Subjects* and *Members*, and to which they owe an *Obedience*.

It is a *weak Argument*, which you commonly make use of; that, whereas Protestants grant a *possibility of Salvation* to *Papists*, which *Papists* deny to *Protestants*, it is much *safser* to be of *that Church*, where *Salvation* may be had by the *Confession* of both sides; that is, to be a *Papist*, than to be of *that Church*, where only the one Party says it may be had, that is, to be a *Protestant*. This is, I say, a *weak Argument*, and can only prevail with Persons of weak Minds; for that that *Charity* which the *One Church* shews to those out of her *Communion*, is a fairer Evidence sure, to all that are *Pious* and *Wise*, of her being a *Sound Part* of the *True Catholick Church*, than the uncharitableness of the *Other*, which shuts out all that are not in her *Communion*, and monopolizes *Salvation* to her self. For what better distinguishing *Character*, or more certain *Mark* can there be of one's belonging to the *Universal Church*, than an *Universal diffusive Charity*, in wishing well to *All*, in hoping well of *All*? A thing wherein the *Communion of Saints*, which We believe, together with the

the *Holy Catholick Church*, doth mainly consist. But besides that the Argument is weak, it is not absolutely true, that all *Catholicks*, as they call themselves, are of that Judgment that no *Protestant* can be saved; the Bishop having produced an instance out of *F. Knot*, which you are so wise as to take no notice of, who grants that the Case may be such, as that a *Protestant*, dying a *Protestant*, may be saved; and then on the other side, this is all that *We Protestants* do or can say in favour of *Papists*; not that they are to be saved, as such; but that they may be saved, though such, as in case of *Invincible Ignorance*, the innocent prejudices of *Education*, the want of *Means* to do better, &c. As to your Charge of *Schism* or *Herefie* against *Protestants*, that hath already been answered; so that, to use your own Words, your proving that no *Protestant* can be saved, signifies no more than a *Quakers* saying, *Thou art damn'd*, when he has nothing else to say.

The *Bishop* adds, that what the *Papists* do now in this way of arguing, the *Donatists* did in *St. Austin's* time; which you tell him, is a gross mistake, and that what he should say is only, that both sides own *True Baptism* amongst the *Donatists*, which these denied amongst *Catholicks*. Very good! And is not this the same thing I pray you? For what gives a possibility of *Salvation*, or a good Title to it, if *True Baptism* does not? Or how can one be a *Christian* without it? and how can one be saved without being a *Christian*? So that to deny the *Truth of Baptism*, as the *Donatists* did deny it amongst the *Orthodox*, is to deny the possibility of *Salvation*. For there is no coming into the *Church* but by *True Baptism*, and no Man, You your self say and We say too, can be saved out of the *Church*. And what is it on the other hand, to grant the *Truth of Baptism*, as the *Orthodox* did grant it to be amongst the *Donatists*, but to grant a possibility of *Salvation*?

on? since he that is truly Baptized is admitted into the Church, and consequently made capable of Salvation; as it is without question through Gods Mercy, in the case of Infants rightly Baptized, and dying Infants, whatever their Parents be, Hereticks or Schismaticks, as those Donatists were: So that in fine, the Orthodox did then grant to the Donatists the Truth of Baptism, which the Donatists would not grant to the Orthodox, and yet this as with seeming advantage on the Donatists side, so with no real prejudice to the Orthodox Cause; as in like manner, Protestants do now grant to Papists a possibility of Salvation, which Papists deny to Protestants; with some seeming advantage on your side, as it may be thought by ignorant people, but I hope with no real prejudice on ours, among those that are truly considering: And this is the true and exact Parallel betwixt the Donatists and you of the Church of Rome, that though others allow you may be saved, you deny Salvation to all, but those of your own Party.

But what a Scene of Parallels have you dressed us up here? By drawing up Eight Comparisons (I perceive you are taken with the number of Eight) betwixt the Donatists and Protestants of the Church of England. Donatists (say you) were no where out of one corner of the World, Africa; (a good large corner, Mr. Revisor) and English Protestants no where out of England. Donatists said, Theirs was the only perfect Church, so you say We do. They endeavoured to justify their Separation, so do We. They appealed to Scripture, so do We, &c. You might, if you had pleased, drawn this Parallel in infinitum, thus: Donatists had Noses on their Faces, so the English Protestants have. They wore Shirts belike, so do We. They eat Meat with Knives, and Pottage with Spoons, so do We, &c. At least, you might have made it reach to Rome, by saying what I shall, with your leave, say for you.

Donatists

Donatists were no where out of one corner of the World, *Africa*; say you: and say I *Papists* are no where out of another corner of the World, *Europe*; unless they travel into other Parts, as sometimes *English Protestants* do too. *Donatists* said, theirs was the only perfect Church; *Papists* say the same of theirs, that it is the *Only* and *True*, tho not the *whole Catholick Church*, &c. and in short, to pin the Basket, the *Donatists* denied Salvation to all other Christians besides themselves, by denying that they had True Baptism: *Papists* do the like, saying, There is no Salvation out of their Church. This is the business which pinches you, and which you will never claw off with all your *Parallels*. However, I hope, since you will have us so near a kin to the *Donatists*, you will be as favourable to *Us*, as the *Old Catholicks* were to *Them*; to own True Baptism amongst *Us*, which you have the more Reason to do, because *We* do not deny it amongst *You*, as the *Donatists* did amongst the *Old Catholicks*; and if that be, I make no question but we may do well enough, notwithstanding all your Dispute that no *Protestant* can be saved?

You are arrived, you say, at the end of this *Real or Pretended Conference*. It seems, it sticks with you still, and you are not yet resolved, whether it were a *Poetical* or *Historical* Narration; and yet it would seem, you are taken with it too: for tho you are come to the end of it, you go on with it still, and make it the Title of all the several following English Treatises, viz. a *Revision of the Conference betwixt D. Morley and F. Darcy*; but that, you will say, was the Printers oversight. In summing up of the business, you shew a wonderful *Modesty*, that you hope you have given *reasonable satisfaction*; that you leave it to *others Judgment*, who will be more impartial (you say) than your self; that you may be mistaken in judging too favourably of your own Labours; and that your *Replies* may be found

unsatisfactory; (as truly I do, and I believe most of the Readers you will meet with will think they are) and in that case, you desire the *Defect* may be charged on *your Weakness*, not on the *Cause* you defend. Nay, therein I do not agree with you; for if such a Champion as you are, fail in the *Defence*, then the Fault must be in the *Cause* you defend; for you who are able to draw necessary Conclusions from probable Arguments, and improve *Sophistry* it self into *Demonstration*, how can you possibly miscarry, when you have a *Cause* to defend, which is it self of *invincible Truth*, and secured from *all possibility of Error*? So that, if there be any *defect*; as I doubt not, but there are many, and I have shewed some in your Discourse, it must not be charged on *your Weakness*, but on the Weakness of your *Cause*. And yet notwithstanding this Fit of *Modesty*, and this seeming distrust of your performance, you come off Triumphantly at last, with Drums beating and Colours flying, but it is not as those who have gotten a Victory, but as those who have surrendered the Town upon Terms. You think, you say, and it were well for you if you could get others that read you to be of the same Mind, that you have done enough to shew that the *Learned Doctor's* Premisses are false, his Illations incoherent, and his whole Discourse not convincing. You will not be offended, I presume, if with *due respect* to your Quality, and Submission to better Judgment, a Man return you your own Complement; and so at present, *Adieu*.

The Bishops Argument from Sense against Transubstantiation.

Mr. REVISER,

I Did unwittingly in my last Discourse run my self beyond my intended length; I must be shorter hereafter, and beg your excuse, if I do not follow you in all your

K

Ex-

Excursions and Wandrings. You enter upon this Argument with *Horror* and *Indignation*, as if you were to act a Tragedy with Buskins on; but this is a piece of *Art* to adorn the Stage, and to amuse the Reader; for what is the Reason of that Fright and Passion? It is you say to see a *Jury* of the *Senses* impanneled to Decide Controversies of *Faith*. Nay, if it be no worse, it is well; I was afraid it had been a *Jury* at the *Old-Baily*, &c. But what is the hurt, if it be so? may not the *Senses* witness and judge of their proper *Objects*? and is not *Carnal Presence*, which you affirm in the *Sacrament*, a proper object of *Carnal Sense*? O! but this is a *Matter of Faith*, you say: True, the *Mystical* and *Spiritual Presence* is *Matter of Faith*; and We do own, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* is *verily* and *indeed received* by the Faithful in that Sense, Really, but *Spiritually*; but still I say, tho this be so, a *Carnal Presence*, if any such thing there be, is, or at least should be a *Matter of Fact*, and so an Object of *Sense*. Ay, but you tell us, We must *shut our Eyes*, *stop our Ears*, *renounce all our Senses*, when they contradict God's express Word. God forbid! for if we do so, how shall we *read* the Word our selves, or hear it read or preached by others, or *understand* the meaning of it, when we *read* it, or *hear* it? It is somewhat you say however; for he that would be a *Right Catholick* must *renounce* all his *Senses*; or else how should he believe the *Doctrin* of *Transubstantiation*, which you have made the very *Test* of your *Catholicism*? and why so, but because it captivates People to an *implicit Faith*, and *blind Obedience*, and engages them to *believe* every thing what you would have to be believed, and to *understand* every thing as you would have it understood. Ay; but, you say, there is no mention of the Grounds of the *Catholick Faith* in this *Treatise*. No; what need was there, that there should? let *Faith* imploy it self on the *Inward Grace*, the Thing signified; the *Senses* may have leave to converse with

with the *Outward Sign*, with their own proper Object; whether it remain naturally as it was, *Bread*; or whether it be Transubstantiated, as you say, into *Flesh*: for this is an *Argument* drawn from the Evidence and Certainty of *Sense*; in which *Faith* has nothing to do, unless you will own that *Seeing* is Believing, and *Feeling* is Believing, as *Christ* says; *Ye have believed, because ye have seen me*; and as it is said of *Thomas*, that he felt and believed. But you, it seems, require such a *Faith*, as must, not only ground it self upon the Testimony of *Sense*, nor comply with our Sensations; but must be contrary and be repugnant to them; as you say pleasantly of your self, that you see 'tis *Bread*, you feel 'tis *Bread*, you tast 'tis *Bread*; but God tells you in the Ear, 'tis *Flesh*. This looks like Inspiration, somewhat like the Story of *Mahomet's Pigeon*.

But, you say, *Sense* is not to be relied on; and this you pretend to prove from the *Ancient Fathers*, from the *Scripture* and from *Reason*. For the *Fathers*, let *S. Cyril of Jerusalem*, say you, speak for all the rest. He sure would have given his Testimony in *Greek*; besides, we want his *Credentials*. It is strange, that amongst all the *Ancient Fathers* you should pitch upon one of a suspected and doubtful Credit; but let it be *S. Cyril*, or *John of Jerusalem*; that's all a case, let us hear what he says, as you report him, *Although it seems to be Bread, yet it is not Bread: although it seems to be Wine, yet it is not Wine*. And what is this in plain English? 'tis no more than if he had said, *Although the outward Elements, the Sacramental Bread and Wine, were before Consecration plainly Bread and Wine, and nothing more than what other common Bread and Wine is, and still after Consecration seem, that is, appear to the Senses to be Bread and Wine, as they were before; yet it is now no longer bare Bread and Wine, and nothing more; but do now, since they were Consecrated to an Holy use, according to Christ's Institution, represent to the Eye of*

Faith, and exhibit to the Souls of *Believers*, Christ's *Body* which was broken on the Cross, and his *Blood* which was shed for the Salvation of Men. Does he, do you think, by heightning *Faith*, decry the Judgment of *Sense*? He saith, as to *Sense*, that it seems to be *Bread* and *Wine* still, nor doth he absolutely deny it to be so; and as to *Faith*, he says, it is not *Bread* and *Wine*, but something else, meaning the Sacramental Representation, and Spiritual Participation of Christ's *Body* and *Blood*. By the way, since the *Wine* is the *Blood*, as well as the *Bread* is the *Body*, how can you justify the withdrawing the *Cup* from the Laity, and Administ'ring the Sacrament under one *Species* only? especially when it was the Practice of the Ancient Church to give it to very *Infants*, in both kinds; and that Practice, as you have told us, grounded on Christ's own Words, *John VI. Unless ye Eat my Flesh and Drink my Blood, you have no Life in you*; which Words your self quote in this manner, *Unless ye eat the Body — you have no Life in you*; leaving out purposely the Drinking of the *Blood*, tho you told us just before, that *Infants* did that too, at least did that, if they did not the other, when there might be danger of giving them the *Bread*. But you'll say, the *Body* alone is sufficient, for the *Blood* is included in the *Body*; but this *Blood* of Christ's is not included in the *Body*; for it was *Shed* and pour'd out, and was therefore to be Sacramentally represented by a distinct *Species*; unless you will have another Miracle to do the Business, that as the *Bread* is miraculously turned into *Flesh*, and the *Wine* into *Blood*; so the *Blood* again is miraculously returned into the *Body*, and reunited to the *Flesh*; and here again, we must renounce our *Senses*; for though we see the *Body* on the *Patin* and the *Blood* in the *Chalice*, yet we must believe the *Blood* to be transva-
 sated into the *Patin*, that it may be joyned to the *Body*, that is, the *Flesh*, and yet still remain in the *Chalice* under the *Species* and Accidents of the *Wine*. For

For Scripture; S. Paul is brought in, 1 Cor. II. 14. *The Natural Man receives not the Things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are Spiritually discerned.* This Text, as also the other, 2 Cor. 10. 4. relates to *Matters of Faith*, as your self rightly observed; tho I do not take you for one of the most Excellent *Textuaries*: for, whatever your *Explication* be, your *Application* is wrong. Yet to apply it, (tho the *Apostle* does not so apply the one or the other) to the *Business* of the *Sacrament*; a *natural Man*, that were not acquainted with *Scripture* and our Blessed Lord's *Institutions*, could not apprehend and find out the meaning of this *Ordinance*, but would look upon it as *Bare Bread and Wine* only, and account it perhaps a *foolish thing* to come to receive a bit of Bread and sup of Wine at the *Priests* hands; or, if he should do so, would find no more benefit by his so doing, than by eating and drinking the like quantity of *Common Bread and Wine* at Home, because he wants *Faith* to apply the *inward Grace* signified and exhibited by those *Precious Symbols* and *Sacred Actions*: whereas a *Spiritual Man*, a *True Believer*, who hath his *Senses* exercised in *Holy things*, and his *Soul* impregnated with the *Influences* of *God's Spirit*, can and doth *Spiritually* discern the *Mystery*, even the *Lord's Body*; and doth in a *spiritual manner* partake thereof, to the *Assurance* of *Pardon* and *strengthening* of *Grace*. And this is it We *Protestants* do say, that the *Sacrament* is not a *Carnal*, but a *Spiritual Ordinance*; and this is that which our *Saviour* himself speaking of this *Subject* saies, *The Flesh profiteth nothing; My Words are Spirit and Life*; and thus, in this *spiritual manner* we do not look upon *Things*, in any *Matter of Faith*, according to the *outward Appearance*, but do say, that the *Body* and the *Blood* of *Christ* is verily and indeed received by the *Faithful* in the *Lord's Supper*, that is, by as many as have *Faith* *spiritually* to discern it. But what is all this to the *Carnal Presence*?
For

For that is the *Τὸ ζητούμενον*, the Thing in question, *Whether* it be or ought to be a *Matter of Faith* or no; that is, *Whether*, as we do believe *Christ* to be *Sacramentally Mystically, Spiritually*, and all this *Really* too, that is, *Verily and indeed*, Present in the Holy Sacrament; So we ought to believe, as you of the Church of *Rome* would have us, that he is there *Carnally* Present. Wherefore, though we cannot Answer your *Cross* purposes, as you have taught your *Popish Pupil* to do, yet we can make you far other and better Answers than what you have made for Mr. *Doctor*, as you please to call him.

But your *Reason*, I see, is the Thing we must trust to; and that is just such an one as a Man would expect from you. You are so kind as to give it us in a *Syllogism*, I call it a *Kindness*, because there we know where to have you.

Senses cannot judg of Things which are not their proper Objects; But such are the Things in Debate in this Controversie: Therefore, Senses cannot judg of these things.

Your *Major*, that *Senses cannot judg of Things that are not their proper Objects*: we need not be shy of granting you, and therefore you needed not to have put your self to the pains of proving it; but then, you will also grant us, on the other side, that *Senses can judg of Things which are their proper Objects*; and there you will find your *Weapon* turn'd back upon you.

Your *Minor* or second Proposition, that *the Things in Debate here are not the proper Object of Senses*, lies upon your hand to prove. But first, what are those *Things*, pray you? For it is my Wonder, that you, as you are a Disputant, did not observe the *Laws of Reasoning* no better, and set down those *Things* in your *Syllogism*, that so your *Conclusion* might have come home to the Business, and not look so lame and doubtful as it does; but it seems that was but your *Prosyllogism*. you follow it here with another.

The proper Meaning or Signification of Words, is the proper

per Object of no Sense.

But the matter here in debate is the proper Meaning or Signification of the Words of Christ, (you mean those words of His, *This is my Body, This is my Blood.*)

Therefore it is the proper Object of no Sense.

Sir, Give me leave to tell you, that both your *Premises* are faulty; though it is the *Second* which I intend to stick upon, as being the *Matter in debate*, you say.

For your *First Proposition*, your self have, I thank you, saved me the labour: You say indeed here, that the only doubt can be about *Hearing*, by Reason of the Connexion betwixt the *Sound* of an Articulate Word, and the *Signification* of it. You do allow the *Sound* to be the Object of the Ear, but not the *Signification*: That is very nice, Sir; for if *Words* be the Object of *Hearing*, what Reason can be given, why the *Signification* of those Words should not be so too? since the Ear doth take in the *Words* together with their *Signification* (supposing that they are *significant* and *intelligible*) and transmits them both to the *Understanding*; or rather, the *Understanding* takes such *Words* with their *Signification*, immediately from the Ear; Whence that saying of the Antients, *Anima habitat in Auribus*, that the *Soul* of Man dwells and takes up her Lodging in the *Ears*. But we must hear you out in proof of your *Proposition*: For, say you, the same *Articulate Sound* is insignificant to one who understands it not, and sometimes signifies different things to Persons of different Languages. V. C. *Lego* to a *Latinist* signifies, I Read, to a *Grecian*, I Speak, to an *Englishman*, Nothing; yet the sound in the Ear is the same to all these three: And therefore I suppose you conclude, the *Signification* of *Words* is not the Object of *Hearing*. I see, by the by, you are finely Vers'd in *Critical Learning*; a man must have a care of you: Why? It is very true and right, that if a *Word* be insignificant, then the *Word* alone must be the Object of *Hearing*, without the *Signification*, because it hath no Signification to accompany

company it ; for we suppose it *insignificant* ; or if the *Word* be *Unintelligible* by him to whom it is spoken, it is all one to such a Person as if it were *insignificant* ; so that he hears only the *Word*, and cannot judge of its *Signification*. But our Business here is about such Words as are very Significant and very Intelligible : *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood* ; and therefore I see no Reason, why the *signification* of those Words, as well as the *Words* themselves, should not be the Object of our *Hearing*. To shew that those Words are thus Significant and Intelligible, I shall offer this instance : Suppose a Friend of yours or mine, should be so kind as to give you or me an *Estate*, an *House*, *Land*, or *Money*, and should bring out a *Lease*, and put into your hand or mine, and say, *Look ye, This is such a House* ; and such an other, and say, *This is such a Piece of Land*, containing so many Acres ; and then fetch out some *Bills* and *Bonds*, and say of them likewise, Here is *One Hundred Pound*, here is *Five Hundred*, &c. And then at last, Assign and deliver them up with his own *Hand* and *Seal*, as a Token of his Love and Friendship, to either of Us and our Uses ; would it not be easie for you or me to *understand* the meaning of that kind Friends Words ? For though we do not see the *House*, and the *Land*, and the *Money* which he spake of, actually before us, in those *Parchments* and *Deeds* which he put into our Hands, and made Ours ; yet we know and are sure, that those *Parchments* and *Deeds* are such *Legal Conveyances*, as will give us a certain *Right* and *Title* to the Possession of those things. And now, why (can you tell me?) is it not alike easie for *you* or *me*, or any other Good *Christian*, to understand our Blessed Master, in his Words of Bequest, at his last Supper ? He took the *Bread* and blessed it, and said, *This is my Body* ; and so of the *Wine*. What can be the proper meaning, but this ? That as *Bread* and *Wine* do nourish and sustain Man's *Natural Life* ; so my *Body*, which is Meat indeed, and my *Blood*, which is Drink indeed,

deed, shall nourish your *Spiritual Life* : And upon this account, I do appoint these Elements of *Bread and Wine* to be the *Symbols* of my precious *Body and Blood*, to be the *Remembrances* of Me till my second coming, and to be the *Conveyances* of Grace, and of all those Benefits which I have procured for you by my Death and Passion.

But what do I enlarge upon a Thing to gain that by Argument, which my Courteous Adversary, though he forgets himself in so doing, doth elsewhere, of his own accord, readily grant me ? nay, obliges and forces me to have it granted ; viz. That these very *Words* of Christ, which are the *Matter in debate*, together with their *Signification*, (for otherwise they signify nothing) are the Object of *Hearing*. For in Answer to what the *Bishop* had said against the Church of *Rome's* interpretation of those Words, that it doth necessarily imply, that our *Senses* may be, and are deceived in their proper Objects, by Teaching and Affirming that to be *Flesh and Blood*, which to all Mens Senses appears to be *Bread and Wine* ; you make this return. I deny your *Minor*, say you, or *Second Proposition* : "For it appears to no Man's Hearing to be *Bread* "and *Wine*, but *Flesh and Blood* ; *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood*, are the express Words of Christ. Now, "Sir, say you to the *Bishop*, you know out of the Apostle, "(I have minded you of it) that *Faith comes by Hearing*, and "Hearing is not mistaken in this Matter. Hence *S. Thomas* "of *Aquin*, say you,

"*Visus, Tactus, Gustus in te fallitur.*

"*Sed Auditu solo tuto creditur.*

Which you thus render in English, *We acknowledge that Sight, Feeling, and Taste, are mistaken here, and we correct their Mistake by the Express Word of God, by Hearing conveyed to our Minds.* And indeed your whole *Ninth Section* is spent upon this Subject, to give the *Hearing* in this respect, the Advantage of all the other *Senses*. For you say, *That when the Senses interfere in their Depositions con-*

cerning

cerning any Object of Faith, we must recur to Hearing, and adhere to that. And this you lay down for a Rule, to which you add further, that *though Reason should take the part of the other Senses, yet we must stick however to Hearing.* That these Passages which I have here produced out of your *Ninth* and *Tenth Sections*, are a demonstrative Evidence of your self-contradiction to what you say here in your *Fifth*; I shall now convince you, or, if not you, the Reader. When you say, that *Hearing is not mistaken in this matter*, that is, in those Words of Christ, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*; Do you mean, that it is not mistaken only in the *sound* of those Words, or in their *signification* also? If in the *sound* of the Words only, then we are where we were, and you have answered the Bishop nothing. For the Bishop disputes against the Church of Rome's Interpretation of those Words, that is, the *signification* or meaning of those Words, as the Church of Rome takes it in her Sense; and you Answer, or should Answer in defence of that Interpretation. And your Answer is, *That Hearing is not mistaken in this matter*; that is, if your Answer signify any thing, in the *signification* of those Words; that when you do hear it said, *This is my Body*, you are certain that you do hear those Words spoken, and you do believe that it is Christ's *Body* and *Blood*; but as a *Papist*, you believe it in a *Carnal* Sense; as I also am as certain when I do hear the Words, that I hear them, and do as verily believe it is Christ's *Body* and *Blood*, but as a *Protestant*, in a *Sacramental*, *Mystical*, and *Spiritual* Sense. So then, take it which way you will, if those Words with their *signification* be the Object of *Hearing*, as you cannot but own your meaning to be, in your Answer to the Bishop's Argument, then you your self overthrow this Proposition of yours, *That the proper meaning or signification of Words, is the proper Object of no Sense.* But if the *signification* of Words, particularly of those Words of Christ, be not the Object of *Hearing*, as you say in this Proposition, it is not, then by consequence, the *Hearing* may be

mistaken; even in that Matter, *Viz.* In those Words, wherein you say it is *not mistaken*; and then you are not only *mistaken* your self, in leaving the Bishop's *Minor* unanswered, but have manifestly *contradicted* your self also, by maintaining one thing here, and defending the contrary elsewhere. And thus much beyond my intendment or expectation to your *Major*.

The Reason why I deny your *Minor*, *viz.* *That the Matter here in debate is the proper meaning or signification of the Words of Christ*, that is, whether they are to be taken *Literally*, as you take them, or *Figuratively*, as we take them; is, because that is but a leading question, to that which is indeed the true and proper Point of the Controversie: For the dispute betwixt us is not about *Words* only, or the *signification* of Words; that were a thing fit for *Criticks* and *Expositors*, though they also sometimes are good Helps for the decision of Controversie; but it is about those *Things* and material Points of *Doctrine*, which are to be treated and discuss'd by *Scripture* and *Reason*, and the *Authorities* of Antient Writers. Now, tho' you do indeed bring these *Words of Christ*, and lay the whole stress of your *Transubstantiation* upon them, neither do we, nor will we avoid you in all or any thing, which you can bring for the defence of so absurd a Doctrine; and though these, as you say, be the *Express* Words of Christ, *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood*, (which were Words likewise used, or Words very like them in the *Jewish Rituals* of the *Passover*) and you contend are *literally* to be taken, at which Rate, we must allow of many *Transubstantiations* in Scripture, that *Christ* is a *Vine*, a *Branch*, a *Door*; nay, that a *Rock* was *Transubstantiated* into *Christ*, or *Christ* into the *Rock*; for *Christ* was that *Rock*; so *S. Paul* saies; and *Herod* must be *Metamorphos'd* into a *Fox*: for does not the Word of God *expressly* say all these Things, *I am the Vine*, *Go tell that Fox*, &c. And if there be a *Figure* in these places, as there is in many more, why not in this? or is it for the Sake of that *Contradictory Do-*

Urine, that we must only in this one thing disbelieve our Senses, and in this one place contradict our own Reason, and lay aside the common usage of Scripture? Yet after all, this is but *λογισμός* to you, and a Beating of the Bush; the Thing it self, wherein the *Cardo Controversiæ* lies, is *Whether in Consecration of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, or after the pronouncing of those Words, This is my Body, This is my Blood, the whole Substance of the Bread be turned into the Substance of Christ's Body, and the whole Substance of the Wine into the Substance of Christ's Blood, &c.* Which Question as the Bishop has stated it, resolves it self into this shorter one, *Whether Christ be Carnally Present in the Sacrament?* which you affirm, we deny: And for the Proof of our Denial, I return you this *Syllogism* borrowed from your own.

The Senses can and may judg of Things that are their proper Objects.

But the Thing in Debate, viz. the Carnal Presence, is a proper Object of the Senses, therefore the Senses can and may judg of it.

The Major must be granted from the Grounds of Common Philosophy, nor can you deny it me; for by saying that the Senses cannot judg of the Things which are not their proper Objects, you must allow, that they can judg of Things that are so. The Minor, that the Carnal Presence is a proper Object of the Senses, will not, I think, be denied by any One that has his Senses. Thus even our Blessed Lord himself, when he appeared to his Disciples, and they took him for a Spirit, saying, *a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*; doth of necessity imply, that a Carnal or Fleshly Presence, as his then was, must be an Object of Sense; that is, it may be Seen, Felt, and the like. And how can it be, that the same Our Blessed Lord should be every day Carnally Present upon your Altars, and that ye the Priests should make his Body, and give Him to the People, and Eat him and Drink him, and yet, that he can neither be Seen, nor Touched, nor Tasted, and that ye Priests cannot say with
St.

S. John, *What we have seen, and what we have handled, that Declare we unto you.*

But you'll say, This of the *Sacrament* is an Extraordinary Thing, 'tis a *Miracle*; One sure of your own making; for, if it were one wrought by *Christ* himself, there would besome *sensible* Effects of it, for to mention only *One* that was wrought by *Him*, which was the *Beginning of his Miracles*, that of *Cana in Galilee*, when he turned the *Water* into *Wine*; do you think, can any Body imagin, that that *Water* was only in the Substance of it turned into *Wine*, and that that *Wine* still retained all the *Species* and *Accidents* of *Water*, as you say the *Bread and Wine* is turned into the *Flesh and Blood* of *Christ*? or, would the People, do you think, that were there, have lookt upon it as a *Miracle*, or owned it to be such, if the *Water* thus turned into *Wine* had not been *Wine* indeed; I mean, if it had not had the *C O S*, the Colour, Smell and Frangency, the Smack and Relish of *Wine*? Alas! it had been a pitiful *Miracle*, a Sorry Demonstration of his *Divinity*, if there had been no more in it than there is in your *Transubstantiation*.

And now I bethink me, it is Time for me to lay down my Pen too, and wait for your Return, after your long *Digression*, (as you call it, and as indeed it is) from the Forty Third, to the Sixtieth Page of your *Revision*.

After you have given us an Account, how the several *Senses* are, and may be deceived in their several Objects; and to that end, entertained your Reader with curious *Instances* out of the *New Philosophy*, and from thence conclude it rash to rely on any *Sensation* contrary to the Word of God, or any Revealed Truth; you do however declare your self against the *Cartesian* Way, which allows no Credit to the *Senses*; as that which *dissolves all Bonds of Commerce amongst Men*, and is only good to make *Scepticks and Atheists* too; seeing it leaves no certain Means to Teach or Learn Faith, and to understand Scripture it self. So that, say you, neither Church nor State can stand, if these Doubts against the *Depositions*

sitions of Senses, without any Ground to the contrary, besides the General Fallibility of the Senses themselves, be really Admitted. And what is it other, or more, that D. Morley Objects against that Doctrin of yours, but that it necessarily implies, that our Senses are deceived in their Proper Objects, and therefore must needs frustrate or make void the End and Use of all Scripture, since we have no other Means whereby we can come to know what is written there, but by our Senses; and you your self do acknowledg, that Faith must be convey'd into our Mind by some Sense, and are therefore forced in despite of your Syllogism, which denied the Thing in Debate to be the Proper Object of the Senses, in General; yet here, in Particular, to determine in favour of Hearing, and to affirm, that that is not mistaken in this Matter, tho all the other Senses are. And what is the Reason that the other Senses may not be credited in this Matter, as well as Hearing? and why is Hearing alone exempt from Error and Mistake in this Matter? since there is a Mistake on the one side or other; for tho we do both Papists and Protestants hear those Words, This is my Body, and are certain We do hear them, and do believe it, Each of Us in our own Sense, to be his Body; yet you taking the Words in a Literal, that is, a Carnal Sense, and We taking them in a Figurative, that is, a Sacramental and Spiritual Sense, according to the True Nature and Purpose of the Institution; either You or We are mistaken in the Signification of the Words, which, together with the Words themselves, is by the Sense of Hearing conveyed into our Understanding. For this, you say, you stick to God's Express Word, and to prove your own, and disprove our Interpretation, you propose this Syllogism.

That Interpretation which is plainly Contradictory to the Express Words of Scripture, doth frustrate the End and Use of Scripture; but such is Your Interpretation of those Words of Christ. Therefore your Interpretation frustrates the End and Use of Scripture.

Here Sir, You challenge the Bishop to shew his Skill in

Sophistry, and to answer this *Syllogism* of yours. I do confess, that he who has to do with you, ought not to be unskilful in that Weapon, tho it be but a Foil, that he may know how to Convince an *Error* as well as Defend the *Truth*; I am very glad at any time, upon that account, to catch you a *Syllogizing*; for it is a certain Sign that you are got into the Trap. But Sir, tho it be so, do not trouble your self, I will look after you.

First then as to your *Major Proposition*, I ask what you mean by the *Express Words* of Scripture: Do you mean the Words barely in the *Letter*, as they sound, or the Words together with their *Signification*, as they import such or such a *Sense*? for you know there are several *Senses* allowed sometimes even in the *express Words* of Scripture; and tho I must say, that the *Instances* which you bring are unquestionable, so that he who shall say, *God did not Create the World*, or *the Word was not in the Beginning*, or *the Word was not made Flesh*, doth plainly *Contradict* the *Express Words* of Scripture which saith, *God did Create Heaven and Earth*, and *In the Beginning was the Word*, and *The Word was made Flesh*; yet in some Cases and in some Places, an Interpretation may, yea, must cross the *Letter*, and yet be so far from voiding the *End* and *Use* of *Scripture*, or *contradicting* it, that it doth intirely agree with it, that is, with the *True* and *Right Sense* and *Meaning* of it, which is the proper *End* and best *Use* of *Scripture*: And with this *Limitation*, I am willing to allow your *Major*, not barely alway to the *Letter*, for that would bring us into many inconveniences, but upon necessary occasions, to avoid those inconveniences, sometime to the *Sense* and *Meaning* of *Scripture*.

Then for your *Minor*, I do without being beholden to that *Limitation*, absolutely and utterly Deny it, and it will be impossible for you ever to prove it, that *Our Interpretation of those Words of Christ is plainly Contradictory to the Express Words of Scripture*. For it is not as you say; say you, *Scripture saies*, That is Christ's Body, *You* (Protestants) *say*, That is not Christ's Body. *Scripture saies*, That is Christ's Blood,

Blood, *You* (Protestants) *say*, That is not Christ's Blood, We do not say so; We say as Scripture saies: We say and believe, that it is *Christ's Body*, that it is *Christ's Blood* in the Sacrament. We use those very Words in the Form of *Consecration*, and our *Ministers*, when they deliver the Consecrated Bread, say, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee*, ——— and when they deliver the Cup, they say, *The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee*, ——— *preserve thy Body and Soul unto Everlasting Life*; so that in so saying of Us, as you do, you do either unwittingly mistake, or wittingly misreport us. The *Contradiction*, what is, doth not lie betwixt *Us* and *Scripture*, but betwixt *us* and *you*, who take the Words in a Gross Carnal Sense, which contradicts not only *Sense* and *Reason*, but *Scripture* it self, in abundance of like Places in *Express Words*, which cannot without many and manifest Absurdities be interpreted according to that Interpretation, which you of the Church of *Rome* put upon these Words.

Give me leave therefore to enlarge my self a little upon the Reason, why I thus *limit* the one Proposition, and *deny* the other of your *Syllogism*.

I say then, That the *Use* and *End* of *Scripture* is not always to be understood according to the *Letter*, but does admit many times of other variety of *sences*, viz. *Metaphors*, *Allegories*, and other *Figurative* and *symbolical* meanings; and that such *Interpretations* are used and allowed by the Holy Writers themselves, and by the Fathers of the Church and by all learned and sound Expositors of *Scripture*; and therefore by consequence that such *Interpretations* cannot be said to be *plainly contradictory* to the *express words* of *scripture*, but do rather by explaining them free them from *Contradiction*, which otherwise they would be liable to, and consequently do not *frustrate*, but highly answer the *End* and *Use* of *Scripture*. And such is *Our Interpretation* of these Words, *This is my Body*, according to the Analogy of Faith, and the known and approved Rules of expounding and understanding *Scripture*; which kind of *Interpretati-*

ous, if they were not allowed, We must of necessity fall into a thousand *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*, deceptions of *sence* and paralogisms of *Reason*, as may appear throughout the whole Bible, in all both its *Historical* and *Mysterious* parts. I shall content my self at present, with a recital of some like passages I have mentioned to you before. *Christ* says of himself, *I am the Vine*, the Prophet calls him the *Branch*, *St. John Baptist* affirms him to be the *Lamb*, and *St. Paul* says of him, that *that Rock was Christ*. These you know are the *express words* of Scripture. How, dear Sir, do you of your Church understand these words, *Literally* or *Figuratively*? Was *Christ* *transubstantiated* into these things, by whose Names he is called? or they into him? And if We are allowed (for indeed we cannot do otherwise with any *sence*) to make *figurative Interpretations* of such expressions as these which We meet with up and down every where in God's Word; how comes it to be *Herese* and a *Capital Crime* in Us to apply the like Interpretation to this Place also? or, what *Authority* can you produce, why *this* Passage should not be interpreted in like manner as those others are, even by *your selves*, as well as by *us*: So that your *Syllogism* is out of doors, and of no force at all, unless you will grant, that *those other Places* are so to be understood also, according to the *Letter* and the *Express Words*; or else, bring some better Reason, than for ought I see, you are Willing or Able to bring; for as yet you have brought none at all, why *these Words* here should not be understood in a *Figurative* and *Mystical Sence*, as *those others*, which are no less *Express* than these are. Wherefore your saying, That *Christ* having *Excepted* only the *Blessed Sacrament* from the Deposition, and consequently, I suppose you mean the certainty of *Senses*, He left all other things subject to them; is but *Petitio Principii*, a begging of the Question: For *Christ* says no more here for *Excepting the Sacrament*, than he said in any of those fore-cited places; and therefore if We may believe Our *Senses* in all things else, but only where *Christ* has *Excepted*, We may

as well, and with as much reason, believe them here in the Matter of the *Sacrament*, as in those other Instances, there being no other *Exception* here than there is there; and consequently We may make the same *Interpretation* of these Words, *This is my Body*, as we do with full allowance, make of those, *I am the Vine*, *Christ was that Rock*; that is, that in the same sence that he was a *Vine* and *that Rock*, so the *Bread* in the *Sacrament* is His *Body*, viz. not in a *Literal* or *Carnal*, but in a *Spiritual* or *Mystical* sence; and that with no more Violence or Injury, much less *Contradiction* to the *Express Words* of Scripture in one place than another; which if you could have shewn any difference betwixt the one and the other, I judge by the pains you have taken in this Argument, that you are not so negligent but that you would not have failed, (as indeed you have) to have done.

Your discourse of *Miracles* will be better reserved till Our next Meeting; as also I willingly pass by the *Flouts* and unbecoming Speeches you fling up and down at the *Bishop*, as thinking it sufficient to have shewn the insufficiency of your *Syllogism*, which you retorted upon His with so much confidence, as if it were unanswerable; and by this means to Justify our own *Interpretation* of these Words, *This is my Body*, and to leave you to the proof of yours, which having done no better than you have, your *Syllogism* you conclude with stands you in little stead; for whatever you can say against them, the *Senses* are and will be *Competent Judges* about their own proper *Objects*: For his Disciples *Senses* were certain, that when *Christ* expressly said, *I am the Vine*, and St. Paul says, *Christ was that Rock*, that *Christ* was not a *Vine* nor a *Rock*, as our Sences are, that the *Bread* is not his *Body* in your sence, in a gross, carnal manner, though we do believe also those *Express Words* of Scripture to be absolutely true, that *Christ* is the *Vine*, and was that *Rock* St. Paul speaks of; and that the *Bread* in the *Sacrament* is his *Body*, and all this *Really* and *Truly*, but *Mystically* and *Spiritually*.

*The Vindication of the Argument drawn from
Sense, against Transubstantiation.*

SIR,

IT is not a little wonder to me, that you should put your self upon a *Task*, to which God has not called you ; For you say, *Had he called you to it, he would have endowed you with a greater strength of Mind and Body, a larger extent of knowledge, and more leisure from other employments than you have.* These I confess, are such disadvantages, as might have deterred another Man from such an Undertaking ; but seeing how you acquit your self in it, it is well for you, that God has *endowed you with other employments.* You know not, you say, why the Bishop should stile his Adversaries Pamphlet, *worthless* ; and you your self, in your Preface before this Review, call him, *The Nameless Author of an Obscure Pamphlet, whose Merits are as Obscure as his Person, Nameless.* Thus you say ; and all that the Bishop says, is, *The Nameless Author of a worthless Pamphlet.* Either you are very *Captious*, sure, who say as much as the Bishop does, nay more than he does, yet seem to be offended ; or is it, that he being One of your party, is out of the *Bishops Jurisdiction* ? And therefore, though you may chastise him, yet the Bishop must not ; or else, if this be not, you are mighty *Forgetful*, to grant a Thing in one Page, and to deny it ; or, which is all one, to question it, in the next. -

The First thing in that Pamphlet, is, a *Distinction* of *Miracles*, that some are *Sensible*, others *Insensible* ; or, as he says, say you, Some are *Motives to Faith*, others *Objects of Faith* ; but where he says so, you do not tell us. I do not

M

meet

meet with these Words in that Account the *Bishop* gives of him, and you your self say, You never saw the Book to your knowledge. Whence had you them then? or how came you to quote him for them, who yet never saw his Book? Well! what he could not, belike you will, at the Rate you prove every thing, prove that there are *Insensible Miracles*. You instance in *Christ's Nativity, Resurrection*, and his going into the Room where his Disciples were, the Doors being shut, though all are not agreed about this last. These were *Miraculous* things, but how *Insensible*, do you say? because not perceived by the *Sense*, while they were a doing? If *Miracles* should be done so, it might be a Question whether they were *Miracles* or no; It is enough that the *Thing* done be perceived, not the *manner of doing* it. As when he turned *Water* into *Wine*, the Servants knew it was *Water* before, and they and the Guests perceived by their Taste, that now it was *Wine*; but how it was turned from *Water*, into *Wine*, they did not know; only their *Senses* were convinced, that that which had been *Water*, was now really *Wine*, and thereupon their *Understanding* was convinced also, That it was the effect of a Supernatural, Divine, Almighty Power: And certainly, if their *Senses* first, and then their *Understanding* had not been so convinced, they would never have owned it for a *Miracle*. Have you any such thing to shew in your *Transubstantiation*? For, though the *Manner of doing* may, and perhaps must be *Insensible*, that is, imperceptible to the *Senses*, in the working of *Miracles*, yet the *Thing* done, the Effect wrought in and by that *Miracle*, is, and must be *Sensible*, or else, it will hardly pass Muster for a *Miracle*. Christ, at his *Birth*, was proclaim'd by Angels, seen by Shepherds, &c. After his *Resurrection* he shewed himself several time to his Disciples, to evince the Truth of it; when he came into them, the Doors being shut; they saw him there with their eyes, after his miraculous entrance, actually

actually present among them. And so, the Woman that was cured of the *Issue of Blood*, she her self, at the instant, and others too afterward, perceived that she was cured; and was not his casting out of Devils *sensible*? Did not the By-standers perceive by a present change of the Parry, and sometimes by the confession of the Evil Spirits themselves, or at least, by the following Effects, that they were turned out of possession? But hold! you do not understand, I perceive, what *sensible* and *Insensible* is, according to the true sence of the Words, for speaking out of *John 21.* of the great number of *Miracles*, which are there said to have been done by *Jesus*, which are no where written, you say, *It is Rash to say, that all these were done in the sight of many, there being no Proofs for it in Scripture or Fathers*; So that it should seem by this, you allow no *Miracles* to be *Sensible*, but those that are done publicly, *in the sight of many*, and intend that those that are done in private are *Insensible*; but this is quite from our Purpose, for by *Sensible*, we mean that which is Perceptible by our Senses, whether the thing be done in *Publick* or in *Private*, it matters not; and by *Insensible*, we mean that which is imperceptible, that is, not that which is not actually perceived, but that which cannot be perceived by our Senses: For though a *Miracle* may be wrought in *private*, so as to be concealed from all Witnesses, so as no Body does perceive it, yet we are not therefore to say, it is *Insensible*; because, for all that, it was or might be in its own nature *Perceptible*, that is, might have been perceived, if any one had been there. Yet in one thing here, we are beholden to you, according to your manner of obliging; for having page 68. taxed it as an Erroneous Opinion of *Protestants*, that no *Miracles* are done, but in *Confirmation of Faith*; yet here, you your self say Indefinitely (and in Our *Logick*, an *Indefinite Proposition* is as good as an *Universal*) that the design of the *Evangelists* in recording the *Miracles of Christ*, was

that Men should believe that Jesus is the Christ, John 20. 31. And seeing they could not Record all his Miracles, they chose out chiefly such as were publick, and most convincing.

You say, that the Protestants own, that God can preserve Substance without Accidents, but you do not tell us, Who those Protestants are, nor where they own it; and then you ask, Why cannot God separate Accidents from Substance, and supply by his Omnipotency, the want of a Subject? If any Protestants say so as you have made them to say, they might answer you, it is not the same Case; for the Substance does not depend on Accidents, as the Accidents do on Substance, but it is your solemn Refuge to flee to God's Omnipotence, which, though it can do all things that can be done; yet cannot Reconcile Contradictions; and then to say, that herein is no Contradiction, but only a particular Exception from I know not how many general Rules of Nature and Necessity against the Sense of all Mankind in all things else, and thus to argue,

Believe your Senses in every Thing else, but not in the Sacrament.

The same Body cannot be in two places at once, but Christ's Body may in a thousand.

Quantity hath extension of parts in every thing else, but here it hath none.

Accidents cannot exist without a Subject, but here they do, &c.

For which, and several other Reasons, and especially for Two Reasons, you say, Transubstantiation must needs be a Miracle; be it so, but then it is one of your own Making, and that against all Possibility, and without any Use in the World; for that answer which our Saviour himself made (John 6.) to the People, who had entertained those words of his, of *Eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood*, as you of the Church of Rome do, as spoken in a *Literal, Gross, Carnal* sense, and were therefore offended at him; *The flesh,*
saith

saith he, *profiteth nothing*; *My words are Spirit and Life*, to shew, that those words of his were not intended by him, in a *Carnal* but a *Spiritual* sence. And that that *Chapter*, and particularly those words, *Unless ye eat my Flesh and drink my Blood*, do belong to the *Sacramental participation* of the *Body and Blood* of Christ, most of the *Interpreters*, some of your own do agree; and you your self have acknowledged *p. 21.* that the *Old Catholicks* grounded their giving the *Communion* to *Infants*, (which was a *Doctrine and Practice* of the *Universal Church*, as one of your own Men tells you, *for Six Hundred years*,) upon those very words, *Unless ye eat the Body you have no Life in you*, as a thing necessary to *Salvation*.

The Bishops Answer to F. Cresseys Letter.

YOU take notice, Mr. *Reviser*, that these Three following Pieces are great part of them *personal*, which kind of things, you say, whether true or false, may be let pass without any prejudice to the *Catholick Cause*: And indeed, no Man of your employments but your self, but would have consulted his own, and his Readers ease, and have let them pass: You justify your own Church whatever her Members be, and tell us, that the *Protestant Church* cannot so easily clear her self; but, say you, *I do not say this to excuse any Fault with reason charged upon the persons mentioned, (except the Gun-powder Plotters)* which words let who will understand for me, for I do not; unless your meaning be, that they (the *Gun-powder Plotters*) may be *excused*, as indeed you do excuse them. As to Mr. *Cressley*, there are several *Reflective Expressions* in a *Letter* of his upon the *English Clergy*, in the late Times, which the *Bishop* justly censures; as this for One, *That the*
Presbyterians

Presbyterians constrained the whole Kingdom to forswear their Religion, by imposing the Covenant. To this the Bishop Answers, That it must be the *whole Kingdoms* taking it, and not their imposing it, that must verify such an Assertion; you say, that the *Proposition*, though it seem *Universal*, is only *indefinite*; so then, *All* did not take it, by your own Concession; but what if the *Majority* did not take it? I say if more did not take it than did take it; then the *Proposition*, whether it be taken *Universally* or *indefinitely*, is not true. Again you say, that the *Kingdom*, by an ordinary *Figure*, is taken for the *Governing part* of it, (by the way it is well that you will allow of a *Figure* in any case, but it is only when it may serve your own turn) so that what is decreed or acted by *That*, may be said to be done by the *Kingdome*, but was that the *whole Kingdome*? or were those *Usurpers* ever owned by any *Honest Men*, that is, *Church of England Men, or Loyal Subjects*, to be the *Governours* of the *Kingdom*? Mr. *Cressley* however is beholden to you, for endeavouring to help him over the stile. Indeed, had Mr. *Cressley* said it in a bemoaning way, as *Elias* did in the same case, he would have been more excusable, but yet he might have had the same Answer given him as God gave to him, That there were *several Thousands* in our *Israel* at that time, who had not bowed the knee to *Baal*, that neither took the *Covenant*, nor complied with the *Usurpation*; but being a *Papist* as you say, and speaking the words by way of *Reproach*, he deserv'd a *Rebuke*.

His *Second Crime*, as you call it, is much of the like nature, his saying, that the *King* was *almost the only person* that remained constant in his Religion, even to the hazard of his *Estate*, and the loss of his *Life*. To which the Bishop Replies, that *many Thousands* were alike constant to it, and lost their *Estates*, and Sacrificed their *Lives* for it; which you, with a *chagrin* or a *chicanery* out of spite or sport turn to Mr. *Cressley's* advantage, by saying that he was *almost the only*

only *Man* who suffered upon the score of his *Protestant Episcopacy*, having intimated before, that had he not stuck only at the destruction of the *Bishops*, the demands of the *Presbyterians* seemed not so intolerable to him, when time was, but that he might have complied with them, for his own *Security*. But this, *Mr. Cressy*, who perhaps knew the story better than you did, could not, would not say; for, to say it, is to sling dirt upon the *Glories* of our *Royal Martyr*, who died in the defence of our *Religion* and our *Laws*, without any such bare respect to the *Bishops* Right, though that also, in his Princely and pious judgment, he might think to be a very considerable point, if not one of the chiefest, next to his *Royal Prerogative*, wherein our *Religion* and our *Laws* were concerned; for it was his Father's *Maxim* before him, that *No Bishop, no King*.

Thirdly, He says, that several of the *Wise* and *Learned* of the *Kings* Clergy were content to buy their security, by a voluntary degrading of themselves from their *Offices* and *Titles*. The *Bishop* does not, as you seem to hint, limit that Term of the *King's* Clergy to the *Bishops* alone, though *Mr. Cressy* does own, that he reflected principally upon the generality of the *Bishops*, who neglected to *Excommunicate* the *Rebells*, which he looks upon as the most proper and most necessary *Function* of their *Order*, and did thereby, says he, signify, that they voluntary ceased to be *Bishops*. As for *Excommunication*, that being a thing which belongs to *Jurisdiction*, I shall leave it to the prudence of my *Superiours*, and beg your excuse, if I pass it over in silence.

A *Fourth* Exception against him is, that he affirms that it may be truly said, that though many of *Them* suffered in extremity, yet it was not properly with an Eye to their *Religion*, but rather their *Fidelity* and *Loyalty* to their *Prince*. Which the *Bishop* says, was boldly and uncharitably said, because that he could not in truth say, that all of them did so,
nor

nor without breach of Charity say, that any of them did so; and because, though a Man do suffer for his *Loyalty*, yet he may have an eye to *Religion* in so Suffering, especially since *Loyalty* and *Obedience* to Our *Sovereign* is a Part of Our *Religion*, whatever it be of yours; besides that those *Clergymen* who thus suffered, if they would have consented to the bringing in of *Presbytery* and the *Directory* instead of *Episcopacy* and the *Liturgy*, might have enjoyed their *Liberties* and their *Living*s too, without Renouncing their *Loyalty* when time was. To all which you answer with a *Scoff*, and like an *Ignoramus-Jury-Man*, bring in Mrs. *Susan* innocent.

To what the *Bishop* says, That *Providence* seem'd to have suffered, that those *Heroical Confessors* should be ejected out of their *Stations*, that being dispersed over the *Nation*, they might sow the seed of *Loyalty* and *Truth*. You ask, Who sowed the *Seeds of Treason and Falshood*, of which there was such store, that it over-run the *Nation*, and are not as yet weeded out. Let me ask you *Sir*, for you peradventure, at least in some measure may be able to Answer your own *Question*; Might not some of your *Emissaries* have a hand in that *Work*?

To what Mr. *Cressley* says, that in the *Catholick Church*, *Censures* proceeding from *Popes* and *Bishops*, ^{the} Prisoners in *Dungeons*, would be dreadful to all under their *Government*. The *Bishop* replies, Why *Clement VII.* (having been made to ride backward upon an *Ass*, and afterwards was imprisoned by the *Emperour Charles V.* His *Army*) did not *Fulminate* the Sentence of *Excommunication* against Him, if he had thought that such a *Fulmination* would have been so dreadful to all under his *Government* as the *Emperour*, being of the *Roman Religion*, was. You scarce take notice of it, but say, it is nothing to your *Purpose*, and though it be as little to mine, and I did not think fit to meddle with it, as being out of my *Sphere*; yet if My Lord of *Winton* hath

not

not already satisfied you, I do promise you, that upon your giving an Account why your *Infallible Father* did not Excommunicate *Charles V.* having so great a provocation as he had to do it, and it being so usual for the *Chair* to vindicate it self in that Way, against the affronts of *Princes*, I will endeavour to give you satisfaction, why Our *English Bishops* in the late Wars, neglected their Office in not Excommunicating the *Rebel Parliament* and *Army*.

What the *Bishop* says, that Mr. *Cressy* may truly confess, that *this whole Passage* was put into his Book by another Hand, without his knowledge, and that, as he was forced to own it in his *first*, so he was not permitted to Retract or Correct it in his *second Edition*; you charge with bringing *Three Odious Accusations*, partly against the *Benedictines*, partly against Mr. *Cressy*, and partly against Both. Now I understand why you call him all the way, Mr. *Cressy*, and *Cressy*, and not *Father Cressy*, for his being a *Benedictine*, and not of the *Society*, though that be an *Antient Grave Order* too, you say. But why Odious Accusations do you call them? For *first*, the *Bishop* says, *As he was credibly informed*, the Thing was done so, as he there says, and therefore that Mr. *Cressy* may confess it *truly*; but then, *Secondly*, Why do you look upon this as such a heinous thing, were it only *Suspicion* and *Guess*, and not *Information*, when you cannot but know that it is ~~no~~ unusual thing among all your *Orders*, be they never so *Grave* or *Holy*, to do such things, without thinking it *Corruption* or *Falshood*; since, by your own Confession, none of those *Orders* can, or at least, will do any thing, but by Consent of his *Superiours*. And this for Mr. *Cressy*, or, if you will, *Father Cressy*.

The Bishop's Sermon before the King, November the 5th. 1667.

Mr. Reviser,

YOU know *November* the 5th is Our *Anniversary Feast* which we keep in memory of Our deliverance from that *Horrid Popish Conspiracy*, which we otherwise call *Gun-Powder Treason*, as We also do keep *January* the 30th. for an *Anniversary Fast*, in Memory and Detestation of that *Execrable Murder* committed upon Our *Royal Martyr King Charles I.* So that you see Our *English Nation* is Impartial in its Resentments on both hands, against *Popish-Plotters* and *Phanatick Rebels*. With this Aggravation on this side, that Our *Secfaries* were permitted by a *Righteous God* to do that which by a *Merciful God* your *Jesuits* were prevented in the doing, though had that *Conspiracy* taken Effect, as it would have been more *direful* in the *Execution*, so it would have had at least as *dismal Consequences*. You do allow of *Festival Days* on such Occasions, but then you say, *They should be spent in considering the danger Men were in, their inability to Avoid it, and God's Mercies in Discovering and Disappointing it, then Thanking God for his Help in overcoming it, and praying him to continue his Protection.* This I hope We do without your Admonition, and I am afraid that our very doing so, is that which offends you. For pray tell me, How can we consider the *danger* we were in, but by telling the *Truth of the Story*? How can We Commemorate God's *Mercy to us*, but by declaring the *wonderful Manner*, how the *Hellish Plot* was discovered, and the *Fatal Blow* disappointed? And how can we expect to have his *Protection* continued, unless we stand upon

upon our Guard against those Impious and Treasonous Principles and *Doctrines*, upon which such Villanous Designs are Founded, and by which such Traiterous Practices are Encouraged? But say you, *to make themselves Worthy of this Blessing of God's Protection, Men must be sorry for their Offences, and Resolve not to Offend again.* 'Tis true what you hint, that Our Sins are our Greatest Foes, but though those Sins may provoke God to desert us indeed, will they excuse such wicked Criminals, as those Plotters were? or ought they to make us less Wary against the Wicked and Treacherous Attempts of our other Enemies? Or is it your drift, that you would have us turn our Thanksgiving Day into a Day of Humiliation? You seem to Prophecie such a Thing, by Preaching to our Parsons out of *Amos*, that God will turn our Feasts into Mourning; and out of *Malachi*, that he will spread the dung of their Solemn Feasts, (the 5th of November especially) upon their Faces. And what is that Dung, (say you) but when these Feasts are Occasions, not to Praise God, but Curse his Servants, when Men, in them, in lieu of Magnifying his Mercy, provoke his Justice, and deserve the Mischief they have escaped, by uncharitable Invektives against Innocents? And what a Prodigious Quantity of this Dung is found in Our Gun-Powder Solemnity, you say, is Evident to any Man, who sees the Sermons made on that Occasion; And so you say of this Sermon of the Bishops, that great part of it is spent in Charging that Horrid Plot on Persons certainly, or at least, probably Innocent, and your Religion it self. I beseech you sir, Were they not Papists that were Contrivers of that Horrid Plot? Were not Fox, Catesby, Garnet, and the Rest, of the Church of Rome? and were they who suffered for that Plot, do you think in Earnest, as you said at first expressly they were Innocent; or certainly, or at least probably Innocent, as you mince the matter afterwards? Certainly, at least probably, you would have it thought so, and as to your Religion, may not we justly charge upon it Principle

and *Doctrines of Disloyalty*, if your own Books and Authors may be credited? It would methinks, have become a Man of your *Learning and Disputacity* to have Answered that Book of the *Bishop of Lincoln*, wherein he hath given a full Account, from your selves, what the Sentiments of your *Church and Religion* are in this matter; rather than to have concerned your self so meanly in One *Single Sermon*. But it is our *Ministry* you complain of, the *Hot-Headed Prophets*, who *Alarm* the people into the *hatred of Popery*; and *Sermons* you would have Prohibited, as well as *Bonfires*; for say you, *These Gunpowder Sermons Preach the people into Gunpowder, and then a little Spark is enough to set them on Fire, and blow all to pieces*. If there be any such *Ministers* that throw *Squibs and Crackers* in their *Pulpits*, I am not to Answer for any one's *indiscreet zeals*, but this is certain, that our *Religion*, as by Law Established, nay, *Church and State* both, stands in a like danger betwixt both the *Jesuited* and the *Phanatick* Principles and Parties, and it concerns every *Faithful Pastour* of the Flock to warn them of such Principles: Nor do I see how the thing can be avoided, especially in the Solemn *Commemoration* of those *mischiefs* which were intended against us by the *one* or the *other* Party: And therefore, I do not believe your *Proposal* will take, or your *Prayer* be heard; That *God would stir up Publick Authority to stop the Preacher's Mouths*.

You say, in the *Sixteen first Pages* of this *Sermon* there are some *slips*; it is a wonder that you would let them slip, and not acquaint your Reader with them; for you seldom slip any advantage which you may with the least probability take hold of. One you take notice of. I shall examine it the rather, that the Reader may see what a *Critick* you are, and how dextrous at finding Faults. The Passage in the *Bishops Sermon* stands thus; *The occasion of these words (God is not the Author of Confusion) was the Disorder,*

Disorder, Faction, and Confusion, which St. Paul saw with his own eyes to be the effects of such Seditious Doctrines, as were brought into the Church and City of Corinth by the Seducers of the times. You say you take this to be a *Slip*, to say, that St. Paul saw it with his own eyes, when St. Paul says himself, 1 Cor. I. 11. *He heard it from those of Chloe.* Well Sir, but may not a Man *see* a thing, and *Hear* it too? Again, *Seeing* is taken for all manner of *Knowing*, especially, by *Experience*, so that what a Man has an undoubted knowledge and experience of, he may be said properly enough, to *see with his own eyes*. For what is it that the Bishop says, *St. Paul saw with his own eyes*? Why, he saw *Disorder, Faction, and Confusion to be the effects of Seditious Doctrines*; as we see with our own eyes, *Plots and Conspiracies*, such as this days was, and the *Deposing and Murdering of Kings*, and the like, to be the effects of the like *Doctrines*. Further had the Bishop indeed quoted that *Text*, which says, that he heard it from those of *Chloe*, or so much as set it in his Margin, then it might have look't like a *Slip*; but the Bishop speaks of St. Paul, that he knew it, as very likely he might, by his own *Observation*, as well as that *Report*.

You clear the *Doctrines* of your Church from prompting the *Actors*, by experience; *Let that*, say you, *decide the Cause*, wo's me! that's a weak business; for, are there not *Protestant Kings*, that are as much *Honoured* and *Obeied* by their Subjects, as much *Beloved* by their Friends and Allies, and *Fear'd* by their enemies, as any *Catholick Kings* are, or have been? *Poperie*, you say, *teaches to obey both Prelate and Prince*; I, and the *Prelate* above the *Prince*, and against the *Prince* too; I, and that *Obedience* which has been paid to the *Pope*, has so weakned that to the *Prince*, that the *Crosier* has broke the *Scepter*; as not only *English History*, but the *Experience* also of *other Countries* will testify; yet you have the *Confidence* to tell us, as from the *Common Voice*,
that

that *without a dose of Popery, or Popish Principles*, our Monarchy can never arrive to its former Vigour. What that *Common Voice* is, and what that *dose of Popery*, you know your own meaning best; I have nothing to do with it.

For the *Pope's Supremacy*, over *Kings* themselves, even in *Temporals*, the *Bishop* quotes several of your own great Authors, not only *Steuchus*, *Bellarmino*, but *Baronius*, and all your *Casuits*, and the whole Tribe of *Jesuits*; to whom you vouchsafe no Answer, only by calling them *Hard Opinions*, and saying, that they being *no Rules of your Faith*, you pass them by, and seem to grant the point, which yet *Bellarmino*, the *Bishop* tells you, calls the *Foundation of the Catholick Religion*. You do by this give us some hope, that you and other *Papists* may take the Oath of *Supremacy*, as We *Protestants* do to the *King*.

Those Two Doctrines, that *Princes Excommunicated and deposed by the Pope* may be, not only deserted, but destroyed by their Subjects, and that all Power which *Sovereign Princes* have over their people is derived from the people, and may be resumed by the people, to be Transferred where the *Pope* shall think fit; you cunningly wave, as thinking it not prudent for you to give your opinion, though *Bellarmino* and all the Order of *Jesuits* hold it.

The *Bishop* gives shrewd Reasons, why the *Clergy* was Forbidden to Marry; that they might have no Obligation of Wife and Children, which other Men have, to endear them to their Country; and why they are Exempted from *Secular Jurisdiction*, that they might be wholly at the *Pope's Devotion*; which Reasons we must be content with, till you, out of your *Divines* and *Controvertists*, furnish us with better.

The Doctrines of *Equivocation*, and *Mental Reservation*, of *Papal Dispensation*, and of keeping no Faith with *Heretics*, you slightly pass over, saying, it is stuff fit for *Oates* his Narrative, and Appeal to Experience, which is sure to condemn you.

Of the indispensable Obligation of your Priests, to conceal what they Hear in Confession, which is so Horrid a Doctrine as King James observes, that no Prince or State can be safe, where there are such Confessors; you say, that the Secret of Confession may bring a Russian to discover his damnable Intention to a Priest, by whom he may be diverted, (or encouraged, you might say,) or the mischief prevented, (or furthered and Sanctified, you might say, in such a Case as that was of Frier Clement, and Rawilick.)

Now Mr. Reviser, have not you fairly Acquitted your self, to set down in the Contents of your 18th Section, *No Seditious Doctrines in the Church of Rome*; and yet, among those Eight, which the Bishop objects to your Church, to give no Answer at all to some, and so pitiful Answers as you do to the rest?

Concerning Penal Laws made against Papists, the Bishop has said enough for their Justification, and I said somewhat my self in the Preface; and that Vaunt or Boast of yours, that you brought Christianity to the English Nation, &c. hath been already disproved; and there needs no more to be said, then only to tell you, that you and I, and all Englishmen, whatever, wherever they be, and of what Religion soever they be, were Born Subjects to the Crown and Government of England, and Gremials of the Church of England; and therefore, if any such do, contrary to the Laws of our Nation, go abroad, and in their Foreign Education, abandon the Principles of Loyalty and Obedience; which every good Subject and Christian ought to have for his King and his Church, (by taking in quite contrary Principles) and then come back again into his Native Country, contrary to the same Laws, to disturb the Peace of his Country, by giving Affronts and disquiets to the Government of Church and State; what other can they expect, or what other course can be taken then to have the Penalties of those Laws, by which our Peace is secured, to be inflicted on such wilful degenerate Offenders?

The

The Bishop of Winton's Letter to Her ROYAL HIGHNESS.

YOU seem very much surpris'd, Mr. *Reviser*, to see this *Letter* made Publick, and that for Two Reasons; The *Bishop* himself hath in the *Preface* to his *Treatises* given very good reason for it. One of your *Reasons* is, the Character the *Bishop* bore, of being *Confessor* to Her as you call it: Well, he had been Her *Tutor* and *Director*, call it you what you will. What then? *There ought to be*, say you, *as great a Freedome betwixt Confessor and Penitent, as to the Soul, as betwixt Man and Wife, as to the Body.* This, I must tell you, is a pretty *Similitude*, which perhaps some may smile at, and some blush. This *Liberty*, you say, is much check'd with the thought, that such a thing may become Publick; but Sir, it was long before this *Letter* was either Published or Written, that the *Bishop* had quit that Relation to Her: Besides there is no *Secret* in it; that Her *R. H.* were She living, could not be offended with the Publication; for it had been *Town-Talk* before, and the *Bishop* writ to Her, purposely out of Service, that, if possible, he might vindicate Her from that *Scandal*; and that he Published it at last he was oblig'd to it in his own defence. Indeed had it been a *Letter* of Her *R. H.* to the *Bishop*, you might have had something to say; but what hurt in Printing a *Letter* of Advice and good Counsel; and if She would not, or did not take it, others now may perhaps. Your other *Reason* of Surprise, is, that it doth in a manner Confirm the report of Her being a *Papist*; To say, in a manner, saves you somewhat. There was such a report indeed, but this *Letter* only acquainted Her *R. H.* with that report, but doth not at all Confirm it, but leaves it as doubtful still, as ever

ever it was; nay, gives us a *probable Argument* She was not a *Papist*, because we read in the *Letter*, that the last time, before the Writing of it, that the *Bishop* had any discourse with Her *R. H.* of things of this Nature, she did seriously affirm to him, that never any *Priest* of the Church of *Rome* had ever been so bold, as to enter into any discourse of Religion with Her, and did, at the same time, promise the *Bishop*, that if any of them should at any time be so bold, She would acquaint him (the *Bishop*) with it: Which She never having done, it does not appear from this *Letter*, nor from any thing else, that I know, that She was a *Papist*; and yet you who are so much surpris'd at it, and so much concern'd for the *Secrets of Princes*, take the Story, hand over head, for granted, and cannot forbear in several places of your Book to shew your satisfaction. And why do you, as any one would think you do, believe it your self, or make any more words of it, but that you would have it believed by others, and then lay the blame upon the Publication of this *Letter*, which says no such thing, but rather the contrary.

Your *Anti-Haman* is such another Man! What saith he? *There seems to be as much difference betwixt the Spiritual Food which Souls receive in the Catholick Church, and that of Protestants, as there is betwixt a Nouriture a Child receives Sucking a Breast stretched with Milk, and that he gets by Sucking a Stopped Finger.* An unhappy Allusion! Did he mean those Children, which you told us, when they receiv'd the Communion, the Priest dip't his Finger in the Chalice, and put it into their Mouths to Suck? or does he mean those people, who like *Waltham* Calves go to hear Prayers in an *Unknown Tongue*, and come home again as *Wise* as they went? What you say of our *Protestant Ministers*, what special directors they are, is silly and Besides the Cushion: You know not what *their* Methods are, and they need none of *yours*.

From the *Character* of Her R. H. Extraordinary good Understanding, you say, *She might easily discover, that the Devil was not so Ugly as he was Painted*; meaning Popery: Which is an expreffion, that some of your *Adversaries* will away with well enough, and hardly any of your *Friends* will thank you for: Though you are a little Unfortunate sometimes in that kind; for you had said but a little before, in the same *Page*, that the people of *England* would never lin discourfing of Religion, *till they Talk'd themselves either into Atheism or Popery*. Are thofe Two then fo Oppofite, that there is no *Medium* betwixt them? or are they fo like and near one another, that it is hard to diftinguifh, and no matter which a Man takes?

Of the *Donatifts* we have had enough before.

The *Report* of the Change of Her R. H. in Religion you had told us before, easily found credit with you, but towards the clofe of the *Review*, p. 123. you feem to Triumph in it, and to that end you quote a pretty large Passage out of the *Letter*, of what She had difcourfed to the *Bifhop*, *That no Worldly confideration of Advantage or Prejudice is to come in Competition with the intereft of the Soul, &c.* Out of thefe truly *Chriftian* *Refolutions* you gather what you please; I fee it is a dangrous thing to truft you with a *Letter*. To what you gather, be it what it will, I fhall only oppofe fome few of the *Bifhop's* own Words under his own hand; *All this Difcourfe of Hers to Me* (they are the *Bifhop's* own Words; I have them in Writing to fhew) *was to prove and make me believe, that the Report of being Wavering in Her Religion, or inclinable to Popery, was Falfe, as She faid I fhould fee by Her receiving the Sacrament the Eafter following with the King, in the Chapel at Whitehall, as She did. vid. the Letter it felf as 'tis printed in my Book.* And what do you gather hence? 1. That
She

she was really inclined to be a Catholick. 2. That the Bishop knew this Inclination, Nay, over the Leaf, you say, he owned it; which, for ought appears by this Letter, are both utterly False. 3. That he endeavoured to divert her from it, chiefly upon Temporal Interest. 4. That either he, or some body advised her to dissemble, and profess her self a Protestant, though she were not so. And lastly, That she was too Generous to be frighted with such Bug-Bears. And thus you say, this Letter confirms the Report of Her being a Papist, and thus I say, at this Rate, you, or any Body may gather *Quidlibet ex Quolibet*, any thing out of any thing; and thus too, this Letter may, if a Witty Man, as you are, had it in hand, confirm the Bishop's and my being Papists, and your being a Protestant; nay, which is more, a True Protestant, for your so Confident Believing, that Her R. H. was a Papist, as your True Protestants do Believe She was, and for your Eagerness in imposing the Belief upon others; and for your Triumphant over the poor Church of England, because she was so, if you Believe and Say aright.

*The Bishop of Winton's Letter, in Answer
to a Letter of a Roman Priest to Him.*

VWE are now come to Our last Stage, which I am sorry you have made so short, M. Reviser; for I begin now to grow in Love with your Company. I am sorry, I say, that you have thought fit to pass over the Regular Priests Letter to the Bishop, which occasioned this Letter of the Bishops to him, because therein many Matters of Religion are discoursed, a great deal concerning the Church of Rome, and several of the Doctrines Controverted betwixt you and us debated; and especially that which One would have thought so Zealous a Catholick as you are,

would not so tamely have put up, the Power and Jurisdiction of your Church called to an Account; and above all, the Church of England Vindicated in Her Separation, and Acquitted from Schism and Heresie, which all the way, throughout your several Treatises, hath been One of your Main Busineses, with the greatest Violence to Charge upon Her. These Considerations One might have imagined, would have Engaged you, besides your Promise in your Title Page, to Revise Dr. Morley's Judgment in Matters of Religion; which Judgment of His, as to the Priest's Letter, he hath sufficiently made known, by Approving it so far as to publish it, and insert it in His Own Treatises. But Sir, you are Wise, and know your Own Reasons, why you would not Meddle with this Priest, whoever he be; only your Reader, having no Account from you, why you make this Baulk, may be surprized, and think peradventure, there is more in it than you are Willing should be known, and yet, One may the more Wonder at this Omission of yours, that a Writing of One that had been of your own Communion, wherein there is so much of Religion argued to your disadvantage, should escape your Censure, and yet you should take up with the Bishop's Letter in Answer to that, which Treats little at all of Religion, but only upon the Priest's free declaration of his sense concerning the Church of Rome, and the Church of England, doth give him Friendly and Prudent Advice to come over into the Protestant Communion; And why Temporal Motives may not, upon a Prudential Account, be used also, as well as Spiritual, which you say, you Papists are so good at, in Catching of Proselytes, be used in such a Persuasive, neither I, nor you, can tell why they may not, I say, be used.

What Account you give of the Priest, I am not concerned; only, I cannot but take Notice, that you call him, Poor Man, and within a Line or Two, say, He has broken his Vow of Poverty; but possibly you call him so, by way

way of *Irony*, meaning, that in Comparison of you, he is a poor pitiful Fellow, and so much your Inferiour, that he deserves no Regard from you, nor any thing what he says. For at length, you come to determine of him, that he has *no Religion*; If it be so, then I confess, he is hardly worth the talking with, or talking of: You bring this Reason for your saying, that he hath *no Religion*, For, say you, *As a Chimæra cannot have a Being in Rerum Naturâ, so there can neither be an Entity Composed of Contradictions, nor a Religion, for the same Reason.* God Bless us from these *Chimæra's*! Have a Care Sir! if this be true, What is become of *Transubstantiation*? It seems by you, that it is grown a *Chimæra*, and so there is no such thing in *Rerum Naturâ*, as being Composed, and made up of so many *Contradictions*.

The *Bishop* has made *Three Periods* of Time, as to the Church of *Rome*; The *Second* of them he determines to be *All that Interval of Ages, from the Church of Rome's beginning, to fall from her Primitive Purity and Integrity, both in Doctrine and Worship, until the Time of Leo X. or until the Councils of Lateran and Trent*; this Interval of Time, he Reckons from the *First Pope, who took upon him the Title of Universal Bishop*, and makes it to Amount to little less than a *Thousand Years*; All the Time then before this, was the *First Period*, all the Time since, the *Third Period*. What can be more plain? But you say, this *Second Age* is yet to come, the *Pope* having never yet taken the Title of *Universal Bishop*; and so I remember you say somewhere else. (*Revis. p. 114.*) It is strange, that you alone should Run Counter to all your Fellows, that you should take from his Holiness that which they All give him, and that which Entitles the *Pope* himself to an *Universal Authority* and *Jurisdiction*, and that upon which his *Supremacy* depends. For, how can you pretend him to be the *Head of the Church*, or *Christ's Vicar*, what will become of the *Papal Monarchy*, if the *Pope* be not *Universal Bishop* and *Pastor*? To go no further

ther for proof, then t'other day; in D. *Stillinger's* Book called the *Rational Account*, &c. there is One whole Chapter, from p. 422 to 450. Wherein the Title of *Universal Bishop* is Canvass'd betwixt the Doctor and his Adversary T. C. Whether it do of Right belong to the Pope or Bishop of Rome, or whether he came fairly by it. And further, because you seem not to know the story, or at least dissemble your Knowledge, I can name you the First Pope who took it upon him: It was *Boniface*, who succeeded *Gregory*: It will not be your Evasion, I hope, to say, the Pope did not take it upon him, but *Phocas* gave it him. That is neither here nor there; The One gave it, the Other took it. It was given then by the Tyrant *Phocas*, (not by *Constantine*, to be sure; his *Donation* hath nothing to do in it) and it was taken by *Antichristian Boniface*, and ever Owned and Maintained since by your *Catholick Writers*. And now I think on't, will not you allow the Pope to be a *Catholick Bishop*, the *Catholick Bishop*? and what is that, I pray you, but *Universal Bishop*? And is not the Bishop of the *Catholick Church* the Bishop of the *Universal Church*?

What you say against our Church of *England* at the last, is nothing but what you have said all along, over and over, and has been answered over and over. Our Church stands upon her own Legs, is subject to no *Foreign Jurisdiction*, owns her Gracious King as *Supream in all Causes*, and over all Persons, *Ecclesiastical*, as well as *Civil*, (which your Church and her Children do not) binds her own, and her Children's Duty and Obedience to Him and his Rightful Heirs and Successors, by Solemn Oaths (which you refuse) and is Assured, that as long as He and They, or any of Them Govern, her Constitution shall never fail. May They always Govern, and may She never fail!

F I N I S.